

# THE SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 606, Vol. 23.

June 8, 1867.

Price 6d.  
Stamped 7d.

## THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND REDISTRIBUTION.

THE House of Commons has arrived at three very important decisions, which, although throwing on the Government the duty of recasting the scheme of redistribution, will very greatly help it in its task. The first of these decisions was, that no borough with a population of less than ten thousand shall henceforth return more than one member. This places fifteen more seats at the disposal of the Government, in addition to the thirty which were provided by the Bill. The Government did not affect to regret the decision of the House, and Mr. DISRAELI explained that the chief reason why he had not himself proposed to carry partial disfranchisement further than he had done was that his political opponents would be the chief sufferers, and he did not wish to incur the suspicion of being guided by merely party motives. The majority in favour of carrying the limit up to ten thousand was, however, decisive, and he can now at once gratify his inclinations and obey the indisputable wish of the House. That he and the House were quite right in wishing for the more extended scheme of redistribution is perfectly clear. Thirty seats were far too few for any satisfactory scheme of redistribution, and although it is extravagant to talk of getting eighty or ninety seats available for redistribution, yet it may be doubted whether forty-five is not too small a number, especially if the new Scotch seats are to be taken from England. The better plan, we confess, would be, in our opinion, to add to the numbers of the House. But the feeling of the House appears to be the other way. No direct expression of opinion has been given on this point; but almost every speaker who has touched on the subject has assumed that his hearers would prefer that the number of English members should be diminished rather than that the whole House should be increased. If seven of the fifteen seats gained by the adoption of Mr. LAING's motion are to be appropriated to Scotland, there will be only eight left for further redistribution in England; and there are so very many large towns in the North which, under the present scheme, are to be left without representation, that there can be little difficulty in disposing of these eight seats. The decision of the House was also justified by considerations derived from the nature of the constituencies affected. There may be reasons why small boroughs that have long returned members to Parliament should not wholly cease to be represented. There is prescription in their favour, and they have a halo of respectable antiquity about them, and are associated with the history of the country. They are also of some special use, and perhaps in about one case in ten return some really useful member who could not otherwise have found a seat. But whatever their claims are, and however great their virtues, they can have no possible call to return two members. One is surely enough for a little decaying Southern town, and if, as sometimes happens, this little town is the centre of an industry such as mines, or fisheries, or lace-making, which pervades a large adjacent district, still this special industry may be perfectly satisfied by having one member to represent it. Mr. DISRAELI—who, although not averse to Mr. LAING's proposal, had to speak against it—could find no better argument than that, if it were carried, the Government would have great difficulty in thinking of new constituencies to benefit by the fresh seats thus made available. This is like the argument that the Irish Church ought to be maintained, because, if it were abolished, no one would know what to do with its revenues. If money is to be had honestly, there are plenty of honest people ready to spend it; and if seats are to be had honestly, there are plenty of new constituencies waiting to be created. Considering that in Lancashire and Yorkshire alone there are five towns with populations above fifteen thousand which are

entirely passed over in the present scheme of redistribution, and that the just claims of the counties have been by no means satisfied, there can be no real difficulty in distributing the whole fifteen seats, even if Scotland does not carry off any of them.

The next decision of the House was that no borough should be totally disfranchised. The blundering, random, grotesque speech of the proposer of the total disfranchisement of all boroughs having a population of less than five thousand must not blind us to the weighty arguments that were to be urged in favour of the proposal itself. In the first place, the ten seats which would have been gained by its adoption were very much wanted, especially if Scotland is to be helped out of England. Large towns and counties ought to have more members than they have, and unless this want is supplied, there is likely to be a new agitation to supply it. The number of small boroughs would still have been very large, and if to have many small boroughs is, for historical and social reasons, a good system, yet these extreme examples of the system might have been advantageously dispensed with. It is always useful not to present an enemy with a very strong case in his favour; and although the argument that Arundel ought not to have as much weight in the House as Birkenhead is a bad one, because it goes a great deal too far, yet it would very much rob the argument of its apparent point if such a strong case as that of Arundel were not to be found. There is also something in what Mr. GLADSTONE said, that a member of Parliament is always supposed to represent the wishes and opinions of his constituents; and even if this is only theoretical—and no one really believes that the electors of Arundel would return a Roman Catholic if he were not a HOWARD, or that the electors of Calne follow or determine the varying shades of Mr. LOWE's liberalism—yet it is a kind of mockery of Parliamentary government that a man who is a representative should have nobody to represent. The precedent of the Reform Bill of 1832 was also in point, and, if a precedent can in such a matter have any weight, it had all the weight a precedent can have. It was then decided that no borough with less than four thousand inhabitants should return two members, and that no borough with less than two thousand inhabitants should return any member; and as the House has decided that the limit of ten thousand shall now mark off the one-membered constituencies as the limit of four thousand did then, it would have been in keeping to have gone on to say that all boroughs with less than five thousand inhabitants shall altogether cease to return representatives. But in spite of all these strong arguments, the House, by a very considerable majority, decided otherwise. It was, as Mr. DISRAELI expected, against totally disenfranchising any place. Nor is there any reason to suppose that this result was produced by the efforts or intrigues of the members representing the boroughs attacked. If the House had thought it best that they should be disfranchised, it was quite in the humour to disfranchise them. By the stern measure of justice it has dealt out to Great Yarmouth, and by the cordiality with which it supported Mr. LAING's motion, it conclusively showed that, now it is bent on doing its work well, private interests cannot make it turn aside from what it thinks the right path. The general feeling appears to have been that small boroughs have their use, and that it is a pity their usefulness should be altogether lost; whereas, if small boroughs were now wholly disfranchised, simply because they were small, there would be no saying where the process was to stop. If representation is to be in accordance with numbers, the whole of the English system must be entirely recast; but if it is not to be recast, why should we disfranchise a small borough which, for the very reason that it is a particularly small borough, answers best the special ends which

their admirers say that small boroughs are destined to serve? Perhaps, too, another motive weighed with the House. It was felt that, if these ten seats were not placed at the disposal of the Government, much less would probably be heard about giving a representation to minorities and cumulative voting. Many members dislike these proposals, but they are not quite sure whether they ought to dislike them or not; and it would be very convenient to get rid of them by a side-wind.

Finally, the House decided that the area of the boroughs with less than ten thousand inhabitants should not be artificially increased so as to bring their population up to ten thousand. Captain HAYTER supported his motion in a speech which did as much as possible to commend it to the favour of the House, and which showed that he was thoroughly master of his subject. His proposal met two of the great arguments against small boroughs. It is urged that they cannot last, and that the only way to stop agitation is to do away with them. He acquiesced in this. It is wished, he said, to have small boroughs for their own sakes, and yet it is feared that small boroughs, because they are small, are sure to perish. There is an easy way of solving the difficulty; make the small boroughs larger, and then, although they will be practically the same, they will not be open to an attack based on their smallness. Then, again, Mr. GLADSTONE had dwelt forcibly on the argument that the members for small boroughs spoke with no weight, because they had no perceptible constituencies. Captain HAYTER met this; he offered to give them constituencies. There should be no more small boroughs, no more members without constituencies, for every constituency should contain a population of at least ten thousand. The proposal was at least ingenious, and deserved consideration. But the House could not possibly adopt it. Even Captain HAYTER himself could not decide how his scheme was to be worked out. He thought it might be done either by cutting a sufficiently big slice out of the counties in which the boroughs were situated, or else by grouping adjacent towns. He could not say which was best, for he must have felt how great were the difficulties besetting either proposal. There are thirty-eight boroughs with a population of less than ten thousand, returning two members, to say nothing of those only returning one member; and it is obvious that to have sliced to pieces the counties in which they are situate, or to have thrown in adjacent towns in every case, would have been to remodel the electoral map of England. Besides, if these boroughs were brought up to the standard of ten thousand inhabitants, why should they be treated differently from other boroughs, and why should these thirty-eight boroughs not be allowed to continue to return two members? The small boroughs must stand on their own merits as small boroughs; and if it is a good thing to have them, we must retain them because it is a good thing, and not try to turn them into something different. However, the subject was well worth discussing, and after it had been discussed the field was clear for the Government to act on. It knows now what the House wishes and what it does not wish. The only point left in doubt is whether fresh seats may be gained by grouping. This was not decided by the rejection of Captain HAYTER's motion, for the House then decided that grouping of towns should not be resorted to for the purpose of strengthening existing boroughs, not that grouping of existing boroughs should not be resorted to for the sake of gaining seats. It may perhaps be gathered, from what has been said in the House, that the views of the Government and the inclinations of Parliament are against gaining further seats by grouping, just as they are, we conceive, against increasing the numbers of the House, and against three-cornered constituencies. This is, however, a matter of opinion, and it is open to any one to surmise that the leaning of the House is the other way. What has been decided is, that the Government shall have for redistribution at least forty-five seats; that no borough shall wholly cease to be represented, and that little boroughs shall not be made artificially large; and these indications of Parliamentary opinion will suffice to guide the Ministry in framing its enlarged scheme of redistribution.

#### THE CROWNED HEADS AT PARIS.

A DEPLORABLE attempt on the CZAR's life is the last and most serious link in a chain of discourtesies offered to the Russian Government in the streets of Paris. The obtrusive impertinence of Maître FLOQUET, and the ill-concealed coldness of the French populace, had spoilt already the harmony of the reunion of crowned heads. A violent outbreak from some Polish refugee was a matter which

might have been feared if not foreseen, but it could scarcely have been anticipated that any member of a learned French profession would have gone out of his way to insult a guest of the French people, even if the guest was a CZAR. There can be no question that the French Government and the French police had done all that in them lay to keep within bounds the fanaticism of the working-classes, the students, and the *émigrés* of the capital. It unfortunately happens that the French people are, and always have been, peculiarly susceptible upon the subject of Poland, and that at the present moment they are in a state of considerable political irritation about things in general. Their indifference to the pageant of Imperial and Royal visitors which has been provided for them by the EMPEROR is obvious, but it is unfortunate that they should not be polite enough or astute enough to disguise it. Ever since the Polish question was buried, it has been the object of NAPOLEON III. to cultivate with more or less successful assiduity the friendship of the Russian EMPEROR. *Contretemps* like those which have occurred this week at the Palais de Justice, on the Boulevards, and in the Bois de Boulogne are almost a political misfortune. It may be said that great statesmen are not likely to be influenced by the intemperance of a discourteous crowd, or the violence of an obscure assassin. But in the first place, Emperors of RUSSIA are not always great statesmen. In the second, straws—even such a straw as M. FLOQUET—show the wind. In their future calculations the CZAR and Prince GORTSCHAKOFF will know how to estimate the sincere friendship of the French masses for the conquerors of Poland. The affronts offered in the heart of Paris to the CZAR are not in themselves events of importance, but they are signs of the times, and as such will not be forgotten by the august parties to the scene.

In some respects NAPOLEON III. has every reason to congratulate himself on the success of his endeavour to draw all Europe to his capital. In itself, the French Exhibition is not a remarkable specimen of the class. But a motley company of sovereigns has undoubtedly collected round it. VOLTAIRE ought to be alive again to describe the circle. The dromedaries and camels, with all their many-coloured attendants, which fill the immediate vicinity of the building, are being fast thrown into the shade by the illustrious guests from every quarter of the world who have arrived, or who are about to arrive. The CZAR and the King of PRUSSIA already are on the spot. The SULTAN, the Viceroy of EGYPT, and even ABBY MULAS are on the eve of arriving, with Oriental trains, and regardless of expense. And a group of Princes and Prime Ministers will form a creditable body-guard of the still more distinguished visitors. Everybody is, or is to be, at Paris, of whom diplomatists have been talking for years. In fact NAPOLEON III. will have collected at the Tuileries and in the Imperial palaces at his disposal a Happy Family of no mean kind. In their wild state of nature, and under the guidance of their simple instincts, all these potentates would be engaged in preying on one another. Providence, it has been thought, has created the CZAR to feed upon the SULTAN; the SULTAN, if he only could, would make a hearty meal on the Viceroy of EGYPT; while the King of the BELGIANS and the King of PRUSSIA are the natural diet for an Emperor of the FRENCH. If the Queen of SPAIN had not at the last moment declined to be present, she would have had the pleasure of meeting her family enemy, the brother of the Emperor of MOROCCO. So rare an assembly of political snakes and rabbits is not often seen, and their after-dinner conversations might furnish ample material for the pen either of VOLTAIRE or of ABOUT. Of all the important personages of the European circle of autocrats, the Emperor of AUSTRIA alone is wanting. Family bereavements and domestic politics are a sufficient reason for his non-attendance. The personal industry of the French EMPEROR at all events has been rewarded by a brilliant, if not a very gay, congress of Royal guests.

Meanwhile all the political wisacres of Europe have begun to rack their brains to discover what momentous Continental changes are to be hatched at this session of Imperial conspirators. When BISMARCK, GORTSCHAKOFF, and NAPOLEON III. meet in one common room, it is thought that the occasion is fraught with mystery and importance. The solemn prophets of the Bourse and of the *cafés* have at all events in their favour the fact that the French EMPEROR is known to be fond of personal conferences, and is thought to be no mean adept in the arts of personal conciliation. It must, however, be admitted that every care was taken by those concerned to impress upon the public that the world was not coming to Paris to diplomatize, but to be amused. The CZAR telegraphed beforehand for boxes to be taken at the Variétés. Balls, concerts,



and receptions were to be the order of the day. Paris is a place where even Count BISMARCK might for a week forget his diplomatic papers, and mix with Prince METTERNICH on the common ground afforded by the amusements of a lively capital. It is satisfactory to be able to feel that little harm can come of a gathering at which so many diplomatic rivals are present. The rabbits at all events will be admitted to share the conspiracies of the snakes. Nobody indeed is left to plot against, except the Emperor of AUSTRIA; and the French EMPEROR, since the last German war, is his one national ally. No great injury will be done either to Turkey or to Europe should M. MOUSTIER and Prince GORTSCHAKOFF arrange the Cretan difficulty without the presence either of Lord STANLEY or of the SULTAN; and, in all other matters, opposing and irreconcilable interests will prevent the Paris group of diplomatists from embarking in any considerable plot to shake the world to its foundations. Europe will survive the Imperial meeting, and the chief hope of everybody will be that the memory of the attempted assassination may perish with its author, and that even M. FLOQUET may be either pardoned or forgotten. It is fortunate that the King of PRUSSIA has not as yet been treated to any display of temper on the part of Parisian crowds. Neither of the illustrious visitors, whatever their political merits, deserve discourtesy at the hands of the French population. Shortly before setting foot in Paris, the Russian EMPEROR, with a tact and a graciousness which does credit to himself or his advisers, had issued a general amnesty to those concerned in the last Polish rebellion. A more delicate act of courtesy or good-feeling towards the irritable nation whom the Czar was about to visit scarcely can be conceived. And the Prussian KING has at all events shown himself superior to petty animosities and antipathies by resorting to the capital of a potentate who a month ago was threatening Prussia with war, if not with disruption. M. FLOQUET may be right in the abstract about Poland, but he certainly has been outdone by his Imperial victim in point of personal chivalry and grace.

Some gloom will be cast over the festive proceedings by the uncertain fate of MAXIMILIAN. No member of the circle present at the Tuileries is likely to be otherwise than deeply touched by the misfortunes of a prince who was induced to embark in his ill-starred enterprise by the personal solicitations of NAPOLEON III. Crowned heads value royal blood very highly. It was the peril and the fate of LOUIS XVI. that set all the Courts and armies of the Continent in motion, and there is probably not a Court in Europe which does not feel personally affected by the danger of the Mexican EMPEROR. The French cannot perhaps with strict justice be accused of having left him unfairly in the middle of his enemies. His own choice, rather than their desertion, is the immediate cause of whatever evil has befallen him. Yet his captivity or death will not fall lightly on the spirits of any member of the impromptu Paris Congress. The French people themselves will be affected by it. The Emperor NAPOLEON might have committed many graver errors than any of which he has been guilty in respect of MAXIMILIAN, and be more easily forgiven both by his own subjects and by the Kings and Emperors of the Old World. If the telegrams which may be expected during the next few days confirm the disastrous rumours of the last fortnight, no Voltairian sketch of the banquets at the Tuileries would be complete without the introduction of a ghost of BANQUO at the scene. The Emperor MAXIMILIAN, like the rest, has been in his day a guest of the French palace. He has eaten the Imperial salt, and has received all possible pledges of Imperial friendship; but both salt and pledges have melted away in the presence of political necessities. The catastrophe that has befallen him is a striking instance of the truth that all Royal courtesies are ephemeral and perishing. It is the misfortune of the French EMPEROR to have thus afforded a contemporaneous illustration of the wisdom of the sacred text, which tells us not to put trust in princes. Against the good faith of NAPOLEON III. Englishmen, at any rate, have no charge to make. Be it from interest, or be it from sincerity, his desire to be on the best of terms with England has not been called in question. But political necessities are stronger than the vows interchanged at any Imperial dinner-parties, and the courtesies of to-day will be a year hence neither a very pleasant recollection nor a binding tie. They are not indeed wholly to be despised. Faintly and feebly they do in some vague way minister to the cause of international peace and tranquillity. They are not meant to be without fruit of the kind, and fruit of the kind they doubtless may be said to bear. It would be idle and futile to treat such fruit as if it were imperishable, or as if it were destined to silence the clash of contending political interests and rival diplomatic aims. The French EMPEROR is in no slight sense an enthusiast, but it would be too much to expect from the

Paris gathering a second Holy, or even a secular, alliance. Judging from the present state of French feeling a millennium is as yet a distant and ideal prospect, and, in spite of the dromedaries of the French Exhibition, the lions of Europe are not likely for many years to lie down quietly with the lambs.

#### KOSSUTH AND HUNGARY.

IN a few days the King of HUNGARY will perform at Pesth one of the few ceremonial observances which are still inseparably associated with a symbolic meaning. To every Hungarian the coronation of the KING implies the solemn acceptance of the Constitution; and it is because the present Emperor of AUSTRIA has hitherto been unwilling to satisfy the condition that he has never ventured, even when he claimed absolute sovereignty, to assume the Hungarian Crown. The subjects with whom he is at last happily reconciled have not yet attained to a Western indifference for the forms which embody ancient rights and traditions. In one of the ceremonies of the coronation, the KING on horseback waves a sword to the four points of the compass from the top of an artificial mound formed of earth contributed for the purpose by every county in the kingdom. If the proceeding were translated into words, it would mean that in Hungary, as distinguished from every other Continental country, the law and the local franchises which it recognises are exempt from central control, and that within the sphere of their attributes the county meetings are as independent as the Diet at Pesth. The details of the agreement which has rendered the coronation possible are not familiarly known to foreigners, but it may be assumed that the concessions of the Diet are not incompatible with the maintenance of the national rights. DEAK and his followers have pertinaciously insisted on the establishment of a responsible Hungarian Ministry, and on the recognition of the laws of 1848; and it is not to be supposed that they can have yielded, to a Sovereign who approached them almost in the character of a suppliant, what they had steadily refused before the Prussian war. It had always been understood that, in return for an unqualified acceptance of the Constitution, the national leaders were prepared to enter on negotiations for a close alliance with Austria. As Hungary is the most wealthy and powerful of all the dominions of the House of HAPSBURG, it is only reasonable that the kingdom should contribute a proportionate share to the revenue and to the army. It would be in the highest degree inconvenient to treat arrangements between the Eastern and Western States as purely diplomatic transactions. Both Hungary and Austria would be powerless to resist foreign aggression if it were uncertain whether both countries would concur in the prosecution of a necessary war.

It is not surprising that the former head of the Hungarian Government should disapprove of a compromise which necessarily excludes some of the demands which he has always deemed indispensable. In a letter to his former friend and political ally, the present leader of the Hungarian Diet, KOSSUTH remonstrates with sorrowful indignation against a treaty which he regards as an abdication of national independence. There is probably a party in Hungary which will still implicitly follow the guidance of the ex-Dictator; and notwithstanding many errors of judgment and an obstinate attachment to illusions, KOSSUTH is not to be confounded with the race of vulgar demagogues. His surprising eloquence, and his undoubted devotion to the patriotic cause, compelled the aristocratic chiefs of the revolution to entrust the conduct of the struggle to the organ and ruler of the people. The fatal blunder of converting a contest for chartered rights into a rebellion against a dynasty precipitated the fall of Hungary, and convicted KOSSUTH of a want of statesmanlike capacity; but his more fortunate associates will not dispute the right of the enthusiastic exile to interest himself in the progress, or the supposed failure, of the cause which he once represented. In his published letter he complains that DEAK has not secured, in the arrangement with the Austrian Government, the substantial and independent administration of the finances and the army, in accordance with the demands of KOSSUTH and of DEAK himself, when they were members of the Ministry of 1848. Some of the measures which form the subject of the present remonstrance relate to matters of domestic administration, and they probably admit of different modes of construction. It is difficult to believe that the Hungarian Ministers would signalize their accession to office by tampering with the characteristically national organization of the counties; and even if they are disposed to imitate French or German centralization, it would seem that their policy can scarcely have been adopted in subservience to Austria. The party in the Council

of the Empire, now sitting at Vienna, which most strongly deprecates Hungarian independence must be totally indifferent to the relations of the Lieutenants of counties with the Government of Pesth. The laws of 1848, passed in a time of revolutionary excitement, necessarily require some modifications now that it has become the object of the Legislature to facilitate the exercise of the functions of the Crown, as well as to guard against possible usurpation. It is as much the interest of Hungary as of any other country to provide for itself a strong and efficient Government. The former leader of a revolution scarcely understands the motives which may have induced his former colleagues to modify extreme pretensions. The EMPEROR and his Austrian subjects will be surprised to learn that the Diet has not been sufficiently exacting, for it is thought necessary to legalize by a declaratory Act his entire reign of nineteen years. The Hungarians have never before recognised the abdication of FERDINAND and the renunciation of the EMPEROR's father, the Archduke FRANCIS JOSEPH, and they now insist on a Royal promise that any future abdication shall be formally notified to the Diet. A document called the Inaugural Diploma, after excusing the irregularity of the accession in 1848, refers to a special law to be passed to remove the difficulty, and recites, like an old English charter, the rights which are to be secured by the coronation oath. The Constitution, the independence of the kingdom, and the strict maintenance of all laws, are once more made obligatory on the conscience of the KING. The Crown of ST. STEPHEN, which was removed to Vienna in 1849, is henceforth not to be taken out of Hungary; the dependent provinces are inseparably united with the monarchy; and it has been thought worth while to stipulate that, in the event of the extinction of the family of HAPSBURG, Hungary may freely elect a new sovereign. The compact resembles in all respects a treaty between sovereign Powers, and yet KOSSUTH can only recognise, in the result of long struggles, a result which he describes as the death of the nation.

A statesmanlike patriot ought to understand that Hungary is not strong enough to stand alone. A chivalrous race of four millions requires in modern Europe the alliance which is provided by a federal union with the Austrian Empire. The majority of the inhabitants of Hungary belong to different Slavonic races, and representatives of some of these tribes attended the ominous gathering of Russian clients in St. Petersburg. Hungary has already been once crushed within twenty years by the power of Russia, and it is only as forming a portion of a great confederacy that the country can hope to resist foreign encroachment. One of the speakers at the St. Petersburg meeting declared that the Slavonic race must throw off at the same time the dominion of the Turk, of the German, and of the Magyar; and the Hungarian Ministers and Diet are fully justified in guarding against the danger by a permanent arrangement of the relations between the Kingdom and the Empire. When the questions which still divide the Austrian States are amicably settled, even Russian ambition will shrink from a wanton conflict with one of the first and most warlike of European Powers. The Army Budget is, as KOSSUTH complains, removed from the exclusive control of the Diet, to be considered by delegates from both halves of the monarchy, and thus subjected to foreign meddling, outvoting, and ultimate decision. The only alternative would be a readjustment on every special occasion of the military relations between the Austrian States and Hungary. As it is assumed that the army will be employed for the common advantage, it seems reasonable that its strength should be regulated by a deputation representing all parts of the monarchy.

If the leader of the Hungarian Diet were to answer the plaintive warnings of his former colleague, he would perhaps explain to him that he has at last met with an Austrian Minister sufficiently bold and liberal to be trusted. Baron BEUST, having determined on ending the long contest between Austria and Hungary, has wisely renounced the policy of haggling about trifles, and of dividing his opponents. The habitual system of instigating the border provinces to resist the pretensions of Hungary has for the first time been definitively abandoned, and the influence of the Crown has been used to induce Croatia to send representatives to the coronation at Pesth. The jealousy of suspicious Hungarian patriots will perhaps be relieved by the spectacle of the difficulties which the Government is encountering at Vienna. In the Council of the Empire the Minister has to defend himself against the charge of having conceded to Hungary some of the indispensable prerogatives of the Imperial Crown. German members of the Opposition demand the revival of obsolete decrees and forgotten patents, by which Baron BEUST's predecessors vainly endeavoured to substitute instalments and compromises for the

complete Hungarian Constitution; and the representatives of Slavonic kingdoms and principalities demand for their own States the privileges which have been exclusively conceded to Hungary. The success of the great experiment by which the Austrian Empire is to be regenerated may be still uncertain, but it was the part of a wise statesman to found his project on historical relations and on constitutional rights.

#### REDISTRIBUTION.

THE first point of importance which the Government will have to determine, in framing the new scheme of redistribution, is whether existing boroughs shall be grouped together in order to gain seats. As Mr. DISRAELI alleges that the chief difficulty of redistribution is to know what to do with the seats that are gained, it is not very probable that he will put himself out of the way to increase the number at his disposal. But even if he wished to gain more than forty-five seats, he might reasonably hesitate before he resorted to grouping. The evils of grouping are very great, although they are not very obvious, and although they might be endured if a great object was to be gained by submitting to them. Disfranchisement is a far better way of gaining seats, if seats must be had; and as disfranchisement has been rejected by the House, it would only be in deference to an overwhelming necessity that recourse should be had to so bad a system as grouping. For grouping destroys the very objects for which small boroughs are kept alive. They exist, or are said to exist, because they enable men who cannot otherwise find a way to Parliament to get a quiet and safe seat, and because they enable landed proprietors who happen to have a turn for patronizing merit to put in men of marked ability. It is not at all true that these purposes are often served, but they sometimes are; and it is also true that there are some independent small boroughs, like Liskeard, which pique themselves on always returning a man of some mark or note. It is because small boroughs answer these purposes in a tolerably satisfactory way, and also perhaps because they enable candidates who are locally unknown to get into Parliament by ways that will not bear close investigation, that small boroughs have been saved at this eleventh hour by the House of Commons. Not any single one of these objects would be fulfilled if small boroughs were grouped, and the very fact of grouping does away with that power to represent small special interests which these little towns not unfrequently have. If two or three boroughs are joined together, it is totally hopeless for a stranger to go down to them. Welsh groups and Scotch groups, whatever other merits they may have under the peculiar circumstances of the districts where they are placed, never think of even listening to a stranger. They always return one of the local gentry. Nor could the patrons of the grouped boroughs use their influence for any other purpose than to return some person in the locality who was tolerably neutral and unoffending, and who represented the compromise to which they had come among themselves. If Arundel was grouped, it is very doubtful whether a Roman Catholic would any longer be returned for it; and if Calne was grouped, Mr. LOWE might find it exceedingly difficult to please two masters. If a member were occasionally returned for a group in defiance of the wishes of the great proprietors, it would only happen through the employment of those small arts of which a resident in a country neighbourhood is sometimes master. A local man who consents to be excluded from country society may sometimes contest a group with success against the nominee of the big people, but he can only do so by being hand in glove with the baser sort of attorneys, and by subscribing largely either to races or dissenting chapels, according to the humour of the district. It is neither for such men, nor for the nominees of great men acting together under the necessity of a compromise which deprives them of all real choice and of the power to give an opening to men of promise, that small boroughs are retained. The public does not wish to have all constituencies counties or big towns, because it wishes to give a chance to men who are not very rich or very eminent, but who can be of the greatest use in Parliament. But a poor, able, independent man had much better contest Middlesex or Manchester than a group of boroughs. He may hope that a well-timed piece of effrontery may bring him in for Middlesex, or that a lively hatred of Mr. BRIGHT's brother may bring him in for Manchester; but how can he possibly hope that three noblemen in Devonshire, whom he does not know, will meet and agree to choose him by way of compromise?

Those who are anxious that seats should be gained by grouping are for the most part those who are also anxious



that these seats, when gained, shall be applied in adding a third member to large constituencies who shall, by some arrangement of votes, be the special representative of the minority. Those who wish this, wish, we think, to use a bad means in order to attain a bad end. The arguments against giving a special representation to minorities seem to us greatly to preponderate. We are aware that it is said that this arrangement would do more than anything else to put down bribery, and it would do so because it would go far to put an end to contested elections. We own that this would be the case, and that is the very reason why we object to it. It would kill all political life in the constituency. If two out of three seats are held by the representatives of one party, and the other seat is to be held by the representative of a small minority, what possible interest can any elector take in politics? His lot is fixed for him. No exertions can get him a third member on his own side, if he belongs to the majority; no folly of his party, no backslidings or extravagances of the Ministry, if his party is in office, can deprive him of the certainty of having one member if he belongs to the minority. This deadness of all political interest is the very worst thing that could befall the country. It is far worse than the deadness which necessarily prevails to some extent where large landowners determine the representation. There is always a hope that the great man may be induced to listen to reason, or moved by the influence of society in London. There is a faint chance that the electors themselves may rebel and carry an independent man. But in constituencies so portioned out that there can be no contest there can be no life at all. And, as Mr. DISRAELI truly said, this representation of minorities must lead to a great feebleness in the Executive. A Ministry is strong when it is in harmony with the country, when a popular impulse carries it forward, when the nation is alive to the questions in which the Ministry takes the warmest interest. But if the constituencies are dead, if there can be no contest in them, the nation cannot give this kind of momentum to the Ministry. Contests at elections are the very soul of representative Government, and contests can only be possible if the minority is forced to work, to persuade, to speak, and to write until it has won a majority. A majority is the proper prize of political exertion, and the very first object of the present Reform Bill has been to induce more persons to interest themselves in awarding this prize. In America, for example, a keen contest was fought out and won by a narrow majority last autumn. The Republican party may have been completely in the wrong, but at any rate it was a triumph of opinion. The nation, having to make a choice, made it, and took the responsibility of adopting a line of policy necessarily fruitful of much good or much evil. Congress was consequently made strong, and hastened on, rashly or prudently, with the work set before it; and each electoral district knew that it was helping or preventing Congress to perform its task. There never was a better example of stirring political life in a nation, and those who believe in political freedom must own that this display of political energy is admirable in itself, even if it happens in some instances to be misdirected.

Far from its being wise to avoid election contests, and to seek to withdraw the possibility of success from those who wish to advance particular opinions, it is, we believe, far more wise to make these contests still more possible than they are, and to make Parliament the representative of as many majorities as possible. The greatest gain we can have is the multiplication of constituencies returning one member. That these constituencies shall represent the nation is to be secured by choosing the constituencies properly. The effect would certainly be the same, in a great measure, as that promised us by the proposed representation of minorities. If Liverpool were divided into three districts, each returning a member, the members returned might very probably be two Conservatives and one Liberal. But the process by which this result would be arrived at would be very different from what it would be under a system specially providing for the representation of minorities. In each of these districts there would be a chance of doing battle for the prize; there would be a hope of better luck next time, and a stimulus to exertion. We do not believe that those who really care for and value the political life of the nation, and wish the masses to be interested in politics, will be much attracted by this scheme for causing an enforced stagnation in big towns and important counties. There is something of an Adullamite flavour in the proposal. It smacks of the wish to mitigate the effects of the Reform Bill, and to get rid of democracy by ingenious contrivances. It is an arrangement by which the

shock of opinions, the keenness and buoyancy of political strife, the inculcation of doctrines by reasoning and persuasion, are to be quieted and silenced throughout some of the most important centres of national activity. It would settle beforehand the political prospects of almost every very large town, and almost every wealthy and populous county. Hitherto the Government has shown a strong leaning against it, and in favour of increasing the number of constituencies returning a single member; and Mr. DISRAELI has justified the course he has taken on the express ground that he wishes to elicit as much as possible a decisive voice from the constituencies, to guide him and fortify the Ministry for the time being. We can only hope that he may persevere, and that the House may go with him. We acknowledge that no great harm would be likely to be done now by creating three-cornered constituencies with the cumulative vote, nor is it open to the Ministry to do much good by creating more new constituencies returning a single member. It will only be possible to try either experiment on a very small scale. But it is of very great importance for the future that the right choice should now be made.

#### RUSSIA AND THE SCLAVONIANS.

THE Ethnographic or Slavonian Exhibition at Moscow was an ingenious adaptation of modern inventions to purposes of long-cherished ambition. In the same spirit in which slave-owners invented anthropology, or the science of negro inferiority, the Russians have for some years cultivated the study of ethnology, as far as it furnishes a pretext for foreign aggression or for encroachment on the rights of a conquered country. Against Turkey and Austria Russia assumes the position of the representative Slavonic Power; while Poland, although long the acknowledged head of the race, is regarded as an alien usurper of Russian or Ruthenian soil. The recent progress of two great European nations to unity suggests the occasion of a convenient imitation or parody. In Germany, as in Italy, all educated persons use the same language, and both countries have in former times possessed a common political organization. Russia has no right whatever to the allegiance of the Servians or the Croats, but philologists have discovered that the languages are derived from the same root, and politicians readily draw the inference that a common tongue indicates the fitness of a common administration. On precisely similar grounds England would be entitled to govern Holland and Denmark, unless indeed the Prussians claimed supremacy over England as the natural rulers of all Low German countries. The reception of delegates from tribes which are subject to foreign Powers was an act which would have caused little surprise at Washington; but it was a remarkable innovation at St. Petersburg, and a discourteous menace to Austria and Turkey was but an awkward preparation for the conciliatory visit of the Emperor ALEXANDER to Paris. Baron BEUST showed proper spirit by announcing in the Council of the Empire the resolution of his Government to withhold from foreign emissaries, and their accomplices, the lenient consideration which is still to be accorded to domestic malcontents. At an entertainment given by the nobility of St. Petersburg to the Slavonic delegates in the presence of an Imperial Minister, a Czechian from Prague, named RIGER, expressed his wish for a political union with Russia, as the legitimate head of the Slavonic race. It is surprising that a subject of the Austrian Crown should profess a preference for Russian despotism over the ancient institutions of his country. Bohemia was a civilized kingdom when the Muscovites had not yet been admitted into the European family; and the dynasty of HAPSBURG, originally chosen by the people, has reigned over the country for three centuries and a half. Long before the beginning of that period Bohemia was a German Electorate, nor have the people since the commencement of history been politically connected with Russia. The kingdom has a provincial Parliament of its own, as well as a voice in the Council of the Empire, and if it requires further guarantees of its franchises, there is every reason to believe that they may be attained by constitutional methods. As a province of Russia, Bohemia would find its language and its religion discouraged; and in case of resistance, it would be exposed to the unrelenting cruelty which has repeatedly desolated Poland. No Russian agitator would dare to proclaim his disloyalty in a foreign capital, or to propose as desirable a transfer of the allegiance of his countrymen. The official encouragement of treasonable declarations of this kind was a wanton insult to Austria.

Affronts to Turkey can scarcely be regarded as innovations in Russian diplomacy, nor is the public reception of the semi-independent Servians of the Principality so offensive as the

affectation of sympathy with Bohemians and Austrian Croats. The SULTAN, who has lately listened in his own palace to the insolent warnings of the Russian Ambassador, may regard with complacency a slight which is passed at the same time on himself and on the Emperor of AUSTRIA. The Panslavonic theory and the defence of orthodox Christianity furnish equally plausible pretences for any meditated aggrandizement of the Russian Empire, and the Mahometans would prefer a cause of quarrel in which they would necessarily find allies to the isolated danger of a religious crusade. The speakers at the St. Petersburg dinner had the honesty to make no special complaint of Turkish oppression; and some of them candidly avowed their equal detestation of Ottomans, of Germans, and of Magyars. It may be doubted whether the objects of Russia will be forwarded by an announcement of Slavonic hostility to all neighbouring nations. The Germans justly regard themselves as missionaries of civilization in the Slavonic countries where they reside as settlers or rulers. Hungary may be a formidable obstacle to a Russian invasion of the South; and even the inhabitants of the Danubian Principalities are conscious that they have no share in the supposed glories of the Slavonic race, inasmuch as they speak a language more akin to Italian or Spanish than to the dialects of the surrounding countries. Notwithstanding the exclusion of Austria from the Confederation, the sympathy of Germany is assured to Austria in any future struggle with a Slavonic insurrection supported by Russian force and intrigue. In a Russian poem recited at the dinner, the author complained that the victory of the Germans over the Czechs at the White Hill was still unavenged. He might have added that the prospects of a gratification of foreign vengeance on Germany have not been brought nearer by recent events. The same rhapsodist remembered that there was one undeniable exception to the universal harmony among Slavonic races which the assembly had met to celebrate. Poland alone was unrepresented in the gathering of the so-called nation which boasts of having protected Europe from the inroads of Asiatic barbarians. "Of all Slavonians," according to the Russian poet, "that nation alone has found sympathy with the world which has ever and everywhere betrayed us. That tribe in our midst which has always played the part of JUDAS has been respected and flattered by foreigners." There is little generosity in attacks on a race which has been crushed with unprecedented severity; but the Poles have survived many things harder to bear than an after-dinner denunciation of their character and history. It would perhaps be judicious to conciliate, if possible, the good will of Poland, before inviting the sympathy of all other tribes which happen to use a Slavonic dialect. Russian menaces have cemented the loyal attachment of Galicia to Austria, and in case of need a foreign intruder would find but uncertain support in the political discontent of Bohemia.

The peril which impends over Eastern Europe from Russian ambition may well suggest to statesmen a regret that the contest of 1854 was not undertaken with a more earnest purpose and in a bolder spirit. A great statesman directing the policy of England and France might perhaps have seized the opportunity of creating a permanent barrier against Russian ambition by the reconstitution of a kingdom of Poland. It was believed that Austria would have been willing to surrender Galicia to an independent State which might have guarded her northern frontier from invasion. There would have been much difficulty in the execution of such a scheme, and perhaps the war might have been prolonged if Russia had been forced into desperate resistance; but the success of a less daring policy has not been encouraging. After ten or eleven years of repose from foreign war, disturbed only by a hopeless insurrection in Poland, Russia is demanding the revision of the Treaty of 1856, and at the same time instigating the subjects of the SULTAN to rebel. Pressure in Galicia is applied whenever the Austrian Government shows an intention of maintaining the balance of power in Eastern Europe, and the Panslavonic exhibition has been contrived for a similar purpose. The journey of the Emperor ALEXANDER and his chief Minister to Paris was probably undertaken in the hope of removing diplomatic obstacles to the enterprise which is meditated against Turkey. To the credit of the French nation, however, the Russian system of ethnology has not been accepted, nor is the cause of Poland forgotten; but the attempt to assassinate the Emperor ALEXANDER when he was under the protection of French honour may cause a reaction of popular feeling in his favour. NAPOLEON III. cannot at present afford an unpopular mistake, and he will consequently not be inclined to form an alliance with Russia, and indirectly with Prussia.

If the Cretan question is settled, there will be no obvious excuse for any additional step towards the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire. Perhaps even the Greeks may look with some suspicion on the ostentatious patronage awarded by Russia to their Slavonic neighbours and co-religionists. It is not their business to emancipate Bohemia or Austrian Servia, and they have little interest in the extension of the Russian dominions in the direction of Constantinople. It is possible that too much importance may have been attached to the journey of the Slavonic delegates to Moscow and St. Petersburg. Of late years the Russian Government has so far changed its domestic practice as to use publicity among its instruments for the promotion of political objects. Speeches which are tolerated may generally claim an official sanction, but in case of need they can always be disavowed. Proposals of rebellion in Turkey, in Hungary, and in Austria may be attributed to the enthusiasm of foreign guests, and no definite meaning can be attached to the intellectual union of the Slavonic races which was the ostensible object of the meeting. If some of the delegates are called to account in Austria for seditious and disloyal language, they will receive no protection from Russia.

#### TALKING POTATOES.

AN impromptu philosopher was describing the habits of the hyena. "This hyena," he said, "goes into the wilderness, and he laughs, and he laughs, and he laughs; but what the devil he laughs at I could never make out." In the same way the member for Dumbartonshire, in discussing Serjeant GASELEE's motion, talked of "talking potatoes"; he talked, and he talked, and he talked, but what on earth a talking potato is we have not the slightest idea. Anyhow, it is a fine term of reproach, and carries with it a subtle invective of its own. No one would like to own in cold blood that he personally was a talking potato, and that is enough. A term has been invented, or rather has flashed across the brain of an old Indian civilian, which is an epigram in itself. Mr. SMOLLETT cannot bear the talking potatoes of the House. He knows the terrible weariness of listening to them. There they go on hour after hour as if they were germinating, and as if their horrible eloquence had eyes, and each eye swelled into a dozen new eyes, and so on to infinity. It is one of the saddest burdens of public life that it is necessary for the public man to listen to those frightfully prolific vegetables. Persons in the quiet walks of private life know what it is to listen to sermons. There are preachers to whom it is torture to listen. They have arts of discourse by which they can prolong their utterances for everlasting. They can always ask questions which there is no one to answer, and one question for ever suggests another. "Have you ever talked to a sheep not of this fold, and what would you say to him 'in confidence?'" was a question lately asked in a village pulpit. There is no end to such interrogations. Did you say this to him? did you say that to him? may follow, till the natural hunger of lunch-time fades into the acquiescence of a hollow despair, or until the cheerful summer twilight settles into the misty summer night. But at any rate, sooner or later, a sermon must come to a close, and possibly there may be present some bold and artful person, who takes advantage of an obscure passage in the discourse, and, pretending to think it an end, stands up, and is ecstatically backed up by an injured congregation. But the talking potato of the House has it all his own way. If no one will listen to him the House may, it is true, be counted out. But generally there is something to come on when his germinating eloquence has exhausted itself, and the only resource is to wait. Mr. SMOLLETT described with much feeling the hindrance that is thus placed in the way of a private member who has charge of a Bill which is as dear to him as a lamb to its mother, or who has a motion to make, or a question to ask, on which his whole thoughts are bent. He cannot leave the House, he cannot ask for a count-out. He must wait very patiently while the talking potato goes on, and then—horror of horrors—when one talking potato sits down another gets up. There is no end to them. At the end of the longest and feeblest sermon there must come fresh air, and cheerful meals, and the company of friends who do not ask purely idiotic questions. But at the close of the oration of one talking potato, another begins germinating and setting his eyes as fruitfully as the other. They all can quote *Hansard*; and is not *Hansard* a work in many double-columned volumes, and practically inexhaustible?

But these talking potatoes, as Mr. SMOLLETT sorrowfully complains, do something besides talk. They push and squeeze



and make a disgraceful noise, hooting and laughing, and giving what the reporters call ironical cheers. The House, as this candid observer informs us, is often more like a bear-garden, or the scene of a prize-fight, than what a House of Commons is naturally expected to be. And this is an increasing evil. There has been much of this kind of interruption to free speech, and free thought, and free voting this Session. The Ministry has got some very burly men among its minor officials. "Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat," was their motto in selecting their SECRETARY of the TREASURY. If he is to keep squires in order, and to guide them and make them obedient, he must be able to come down heavily on the toes of men, and crush out disobedience by the mere weight of bone and flesh. The uses of such men are obvious when a close division is expected. They can bustle and bully and obstruct, or they can be gentle and pleasant and, comparatively speaking, small and unobtrusive, according as caprice or the exigencies of the Ministry dictate. During debates of some importance the talking potatoes are kept so far silent that they are ashamed to occupy too much of the time of the House, and the SPEAKER wisely refuses to see them. But they can, nevertheless, do something that is very pleasant to them. They can screech and make wild noises, expressive of the rude pleasure or displeasure that they feel. And they are so beautifully docile. Last year it was the cue of these good creatures on the Conservative side to make much of Mr. LOWE, he was so wise, so independent, so beautifully, grandly eloquent. This year he has said exactly the same things, only, if possible, in better style and with a more finished art, and in a quieter and more temperate manner. But they are all suddenly changed. They are germinating the other way. Their cue is a quiet revolution, and they talk and shout, not for Conservatism, but for democracy. There is, too, in the class of the minor orators of the House, a noble disregard of the courtesies of society. Mr. HARVEY LEWIS is not a bad sort of talking potato, and Mr. LAFARD is a talking potato of the first order, if indeed he is not an altogether higher and more distinguished vegetable. And yet these two potatoes have quarrelled. They were talking potatoes to some purpose, for one called the other a traitor, and the other called him by some name which was so uncommonly Saxon that it has never found its way into print. We cannot wonder that Mr. SMOLLETT, in a fit of comic despair, should have got so tired and so ashamed of this worst aspect of the House of Commons that he should have proposed to diminish its numbers, and should have suggested that the best thing to do with the seats gained by disfranchisement was to keep them vacant.

Mr. SMOLLETT must have known perfectly well that his proposal could not be adopted. The talking potatoes would scarcely consent to exclude themselves. On the contrary, times will soon be better for them than ever. We may be sure that in a Reformed Parliament there will be more talking than there is now. The seats of members will be more precarious; they will be more anxious to please their constituents, and more anxious to acquire a little feeble notoriety as a ground for claiming not to be extinguished altogether. A constituency that returns a great territorial magnate with ancestral claims on its respect is satisfied with having done its duty. If he never says a word, if he never attends a division, that is his business; but the county has done its duty, and is true to itself and its history. But the new representative of a new constituency must make himself heard. He must redeem his pledges; he must furnish materials for leading articles to the local journals; he must show that he reads at least as much of *Hansard* as the representative of the next big town in the district. In a democratic assembly the members soon begin to address, not those who by courtesy are called their hearers, but the large audience of the constituency that has returned them. The first step, as the experience of the American Congress has shown, is to read from a written speech; for if no one listens to a talking potato, or cares what he says, why should he give himself the trouble of learning his speech by heart? The next stage is not to speak the speech at all, but to have it taken as read, and send it straight to the papers, which would at any rate be a relief to Mr. SMOLLETT. The last stage is neither to speak a speech nor to write it, but to send to the papers one of a set of stock speeches which would do for any occasion. Last autumn the New York papers chronicled with delight the astonishing fact that, on a certain occasion of public festivity, General So-and-So made his own speech and composed it for the occasion. The public was lost in surprise; it had, as it were, won on the double event. The usual course was for a talking

potato of any kind of distinction to speak some one else's speech adapted to a totally different set of circumstances. Men could conceive that, by some odd chance, a public orator might talk his own talk, and they could conceive that he might say something applicable to the occasion. But that his remarks should be at once original and relevant was a wonder of wonders; and the marvel was recorded with appropriate ecstasy. Many and great as we hope will be the advantages of the new Reform Bill, that of discouraging talkers will not be one of them. There will be in the House an increasing flux of that talk which is really addressed not to the SPEAKER, or the House, or the Reporters' Gallery, but to the purchasers of local newspapers. Nor is there much hope that a new House of Commons will behave better. Conservatives will try to crush the toes of dissentients under the heels of bigger and burlier and more bullying officials, and Liberal members, when conversing playfully in the lobbies, will, we fear, add to their Saxon some of those Latin phrases of execration which ecclesiastical experience pronounces to be so effective. The House henceforth is not likely to be less prosy or better mannered. This is an evil, but, as Mr. SMOLLETT's proposal to diminish the number of the House is not likely to find favour, it is an evil that must be endured.

#### THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

IT is agreed on all sides that, for good or for evil, a new political state of things has already been entered upon. "In two or three years a more active spirit will pervade our legislation"—such is Mr. GLADSTONE's sufficiently cautious, but sufficiently accurate, anticipation of the coming régime. We are not passing through a revolution, in the ordinary sense of the word, because there is nothing violent about the change. But in the political world a cataclysm is not more efficacious than are the silent, steady, and gigantic upheavals and subsidences of continents in the economy of nature. There is one institution which must partake in the coming change, and that is the House of Lords. Very likely it will not be the subject of a Reform Bill; but its work must be adapted to new duties and responsibilities. There is, perhaps, a gleam of consciousness of this necessity in the Peers themselves, if we may believe the rumour which is gaining currency that it is proposed to abandon the system of proxies. No doubt this is an abuse so patent, and the arguments in its favour are so puerile, that the practice cannot stand a moment's sifting. It is useless to inquire into its antiquarian history; it has been retained as an aristocratic *privilegium*, and a superb *differentia* from the proceedings of the Lower House. The very first function of any assembly entrusted with powers of legislation is that it should be a deliberative assembly. To take counsel together, to advise and listen to debate, to be strengthened in giving judgment by hearing both sides—these are elementary antecedents for coming to a sound decision on controverted questions. But the proxy system entirely ignores the very first principles of natural propriety. An assembly whose "consultations" are daily prayed for during its Session, that all sorts of good things "may be settled by its endeavours," which nevertheless, on the most important matters, as far as perhaps the majority of its members is concerned, never consults at all or endeavours anything, but delivers its suffrages blindfold and ready cut and dried into the hands of a party leader, is an absurdity and a mockery. The prolonged continuance of this proxy system is only a proof of the blind tenacity to tradition which marks the British mind, and which has done so much to hinder change, as well for evil, it must be admitted, as for good. The rumoured abandonment of this flagrant insult to common sense and propriety suggests the hope that a feeling is growing up, among the Peers, that our Upper Chamber must enter into a course of profitable self-examination.

It has come to be taken for granted—chiefly, because, in fact, the thing has hardly been thought about at all—that an hereditary peerage and an hereditary right for Peers to sit as legislators are inseparable. Yet the spiritual Lords are not and never were legislators by inheritance, and it is quite possible to get all the advantages of an Upper House without basing its existence on primogeniture and succession to lands and titles. Abstractedly, there is little to be said for the principle of hereditary legislation. Theoretically, the House of Lords might become an assembly of cretins and idiots; and to be born with a succession to a fine name and estate is no guarantee for honesty, education, or any virtue under heaven. Practically, of course, the Peerage holds its own. In comparison with any other four hundred men in the kingdom, four hundred Peers probably are, and generally

have been, equal to their untitled contemporaries in intelligence, and in all sorts of personal and acquired capacities. It would be very strange if it were not so, seeing that the Peers have in every way—in education, in means, in traditions, in leisure, and in all the ordinary helps to distinction—nine points out of ten in their favour at starting in the race of life. But this only shows that the Peers are what they make themselves. They have hitherto held their own because, on the whole, they have, if not surpassed, at any rate not fallen short of, those capacities for legislative functions which might reasonably be required of them. But all this is by a happy accident, and by no virtue of that charter of privilege by which they are legislators. High birth no more qualifies a man—it is almost stupid to repeat such a truism—to pass laws than the colour of his hair. The question then, which hitherto has pretty well answered itself, but which will always be recurring, and the answer to which will, as the new *régime* advances, be very sharply scrutinized, is, How far do the Lords discharge those functions which belong to their order? The world, after all, accepts, in the long run, every man's estimate of himself. A charlatan succeeds and is popular, if he is clever enough to appraise himself at a high figure. If a man sets up for a saint, society will not often dispute his pretensions. Or if another chooses to be a victim, few will interfere with his self-immolation. If the Lords respect themselves, the world will be slow to oppose the verdict which a titled and hereditary order passes on itself. Whether the Lords do really value their very exceptional, and as many think their anomalous, position in the State, is a matter on which the Lords themselves are the best judges. It is difficult to get a house of twenty members out of the roll of Peers, although it exceeds four hundred in number. And the justification for this habitual abstinence from, if not neglect of, their duties is, first, that there is nothing for the Lords to do; and next, that the Lords generally do not feel themselves fit to do anything. These are the only reasons we have ever heard for the scanty attendance on those gorgeous red leather benches. How far they will avail in the next few years remains to be seen.

In popular estimation, the practical value, in these latter days, of the House of Lords consists in the Peers acting as buffers to the political machine. They are said to be very usefully employed as a drag on the hasty and heated wheel of House of Commons legislation, in putting off crude reforms, and in gaining time for popular panics to subside. As a matter of fact, it may be doubted whether history bears out these very negative claims to usefulness on the part of the Upper House. The chief measure of late years which has passed in hot haste, and under the access of a furious fit of ill-temper on the part of Parliament, was the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill; and in this case the fanaticism of the House of Lords was quite equal to that of the Commons. Here, at any rate, the Lords failed in their duty to correct a surprise and to gain a hearing for a terrorized minority. And, on the other hand, while it is easy enough to count up measures which have been delayed, obstructed, and postponed by the Lords, it is difficult to point to one which sooner or later they have not yielded; and for the best of all reasons, that in the last resource, when the Crown and Commons combine, the Lords must yield, or be summarily swamped. Earl GREY and the Reform Bill settled this matter once and for ever. The House of Commons deliberates and legislates under the wholesome fear of dissolution, but the member displaced to-day may be re-elected to-morrow. Over the House of Lords hangs the ever present possibility of an unlimited creation of Peers—that is, of annihilation. The Upper House, once swamped, can never be drained off. The House of Lords must, therefore, in the long run, yield. Thus its buffer function in fact amounts to but little; and in theory it does not exist at all.

Still we are far from saying that in practice the Upper Chamber may not and does not render great service in government. But it is the small minority that attend to business who are of this use; not the four hundred and odd titled personages as a class. The improvements made in Bills sent from the Commons are due to the control and vigilance, not of the Peerage collectively, but of a very few members who recognise and perform their duty to the country. The Lords have great leisure; they have the advantage of surveying as a whole the deliberations of the Lower House; they have neither the terrors of hustings pledges nor the dread of a dissolution to paralyse them; and it would therefore be strange if what they do did not often do very well. But it is to the existence of a separate and non-elected Chamber that these constitutional gains are due; not to the permanence, as an Estate of the Realm, of an Hereditary House of Temporal

Peers. In other words, what is likely to be canvassed is not the value or the necessity of a Second Chamber, but the constitution of the present English Upper House. These are sifting times, these days of ours. Events seem to be preparing the way for what, sooner or later, is sure to become a matter of more than theoretical discussion by essay-writers—whether a Sovereign is necessary for a constitutional Government, and whether hereditary legislators are the only means by which the unquestionable advantages of a Second Chamber can be secured. Some theorists are for recruiting the stagnant energies of the House of Lords by the addition to its unwieldy ranks of a considerable number of Life Peers; but the exceptional activity of the ephemerals would only bring into stronger prominence the habitual sluggishness of the permanent grandees, and would precipitate their fate as legislators. A more plausible innovation would be to form a legislative body out of the hereditary peerage. This would, practically, be the revival of Lords of the Council consisting of Peers only. And there is precedent for this in the existing House of Lords. If the Irish and Scottish peerages are sufficiently represented by delegation—in the one case by Peers elected for life, and in the other by Peers elected for each Parliament—it may be thought not very unreasonable to extend this principle to the whole Empire. Perhaps the fault of the House of Lords is its size. What is everybody's business is practically nobody's business. As a matter of fact, the work of the House of Lords is conducted by a delegation of those Peers who think it worth while to attend; and if the Peers who never attend own, by their perpetual absence, that they feel no interest in or capacity for their constitutional work, they seem already to be asking the Constitution to relieve them from duties to which they confess themselves to be unequal. What has happened in the appellate jurisdiction of the Lords, and what is further to happen, may suggest the not improbable future of the House of Lords. Theoretically, every Peer, whatever his qualifications may be, is a judge, and with a vote equal to that of Lord CHELMSFORD or Lord WESTBURY, in such an appeal case as *SMALL v. ATTWOOD*. Practically, this absurdity and wrong is unimportant, because in appeal cases only the Law Lords sit and adjudicate; but the theoretical wrong exists, though it is probably not destined to a very long life. Obsolete and worn-out laws, penalties which are never enforced, and immunities which are never claimed, are nowadays treated as cobwebs. A Peer is as much and as little born a judge as he is born a legislator. The Peers now own that they have no natural or divine qualifications for expounding law, and so they refer and delegate their duties as judges in appeal to a committee or delegation. The question is whether any real distinction exists between natural and hereditary qualifications to administer and expound laws—a claim which has been tacitly abandoned—and natural and hereditary qualifications to make laws, which claim is still retained.

#### AMERICAN FINANCE.

THE temporary decline in American prosperity has probably put a final end to the ambitious project of paying off the debt. Only a few weeks have passed since Mr. GLADSTONE, with his usual impulsive credulity, proposed the financial system of the United States as a model to the House of Commons. Having been suddenly seized with a passion for buying up perpetual annuities in preference to reduction of taxes, he dwelt with eager sympathy on the American achievement of paying off several millions of debt in a single year. It might have been observed by a sceptical opponent that the public credit of England is shown by the price of Consols to be twice as high as that of the United States, and that the difference between three per cent. and six per cent. in the rate of interest may largely affect the question whether it is expedient to get rid of a mortgage. The American effort, in fact, deserved attention and admiration rather because it involved a conscious sacrifice for the public good than as a necessarily advantageous operation. The provision of a large surplus for the discharge of debt is more economical than the indirect contrivance of converting perpetual obligations into terminable annuities. The people of the United States are justly proud of their daring originality, and they have regarded with much complacency their own success in borrowing, during a four years' war with an inferior enemy, about the same amount which enabled England to contend for twenty years against half the Continent of Europe. A more legitimate satisfaction would have been created by the reverse process of removing the national burdens with equally unprecedented rapidity. After the end of the war some sanguine patriots



announced that the debt would be paid off at once by voluntary contributions, and the continuance of the war taxes to the present time indicates a more serious intention of relieving the public finances. In a fiscal system adopted for an exceptional purpose defects and irregularities might be tolerated, in the belief that anomalies would disappear as soon as they had effected their object. The taxation of America is the rudest, the most oppressive, and the worst in the world, but if the debt were once discharged, the greater portion of the public revenue would become unnecessary. The only financial difficulty of Congress, before the war, was to devise modes of expenditure which might justify discriminating duties imposed for the benefit of certain classes of domestic producers. Although the Federal expenditure has since been largely increased, the cost of maintaining the civil Government, and the army and navy, would still be light in proportion to the resources of the nation, if the interest on the debt were not added to the annual charge.

The inflated prosperity which accompanied and followed the war rendered taxpayers comparatively indifferent to the amount and to the adjustment of public burdens. The paper currency, with its consequence of high prices, had enriched a numerous and powerful section of the community, and the corresponding losses attending a rapid change in values had not been fully appreciated. Corrupt and selfish interests had a large share in promoting the general popularity of extravagant taxation. It is almost impossible to devise an impost which is absolutely just, and indirect taxes invariably benefit some classes of producers or traders at the expense of their neighbours. American astuteness has always known how to profit by patriotic excitement. Before a dollar had been spent in the war, Mr. MORRILL took the opportunity of the withdrawal of the Southern members to carry a protective tariff through Congress; and at every stage of the subsequent contest manufacturers and dealers have used the public necessities as an opportunity for placing additional restrictions on the liberty of consumers. While journalists were taunting foreign nations with the superiority of a country which raised several millions of revenue beyond its expenditure, cotton-spinners, wool-growers, and iron-masters were gloating over the tribute which they levied on pretext of allowing the Treasury a small percentage of their gains. The result of recklessness, of ignorance, and of cunning is a tariff of duties on sixteen thousand articles of consumption, involving the interference of tax officers and collectors in every stage of every industrial and commercial process. As a natural consequence, and through the reaction from a state of artificial prosperity, almost every trade is now embarrassed or stagnant. The strikes and combinations of workmen, which are at present more troublesome in the United States than in England, are immediately caused by the rise in prices which necessarily followed an excess of currency and a general creation of monopolies. It may be incidentally remarked as an instructive fact that the possession of political power affords no security against conflicts between employers and workmen. In New York the Legislature has recently affirmed by law the doctrine that a working-day consists of eight hours; but the corollary, that the payment shall be calculated on a task of ten hours, has not yet been practically established. English manufacturers, who are naturally alarmed at the tendency of Trades' Unions to check production, may find some consolation in the suicidal policy of workmen as well as masters in America. The competition of a country which directly traverses in its legislation all the principles of political economy is not greatly to be dreaded in the neutral markets of the world.

The SECRETARY of the TREASURY has announced that the debt is, for the present, likely to be rather increased than diminished. The lavish grants by which Congress has sought to secure popular favour involve a heavy outlay, and the produce of the taxes diminishes rapidly with the depression of trade and the collapse of private fortunes. It is said that a well-known draper of New York, supposed to be the richest tradesman in the world, has lately returned to the Income-tax collector one-tenth of his last year's profits; and it is scarcely a subject for regret that the excessive luxury which contributed largely to the revenue has been effectually checked. A country such as Federal America cannot be really and permanently impoverished by any interruption of commercial activity; but the capacity to pay taxes may vary greatly with the prosperity of trade, and it is highly improbable that money will be forthcoming for the reduction of the debt while all classes are complaining of intolerable burdens. The working expenses of Government and the interest of the debt must necessarily be provided, but the self-imposed obligation of diminishing the principal will not be recognised in

time of economical pressure. In England a great preponderance of argument is opposed to the policy of buying up annuities of three per cent. which are yearly declining in value. A similar investment in the United States might at first sight seem more desirable, because it would produce twice the rate of profit; but the taxes which might be abolished as the alternative of reducing the debt are incomparably more burdensome than any part of the English fiscal system. PITT's lists of Excise and Customs' duties, with their appendages of stamps and licenses, were remarkable instances of ubiquitous fiscal vexation; but the financiers of modern America have improved upon their model. Every commodity, besides the addition to its cost, is dearer or cheaper in comparison with other articles than its natural rate; and the Customs' duties impose on the consumer a charge far in excess of the actual payment to the public exchequer. The protective tariff will probably be maintained for the present; but it is nearly certain that the internal taxes will be remodelled and largely reduced, even at the cost of incurring additional debt. Until the political reconstruction of the Southern States is completed, a considerable army must be maintained to enforce the arbitrary legislation of Congress; but hitherto the civil establishment has not expanded in proportion to the extension of the central power. American Ministers of Finance have no Parliament at their back to sanction their policy, and the majority in Congress is always inferior in economic knowledge and intelligence to the SECRETARY of the TREASURY. Judicious financiers will use any influence they may possess to enforce frugality and retrenchment, as the first condition of reforming and simplifying the fiscal system. The burden of the debt will be most effectually diminished by an improvement of the national credit which would enable the Government to re-borrow at a lower rate of interest. The inevitable growth of population will constantly diminish the individual pressure of the debt, and in all parts of the world fixed liabilities will become lighter as the price of the precious metals declines. The discharge of the debt would be perhaps a still more unprofitable speculation in America than in England; and, having once gone out of fashion, the scheme is not likely to be resumed. The Americans, while they share with all mankind a dislike to paying taxes, also inherit from their English ancestors a special antipathy to the domiciliary visits of collectors and excisemen. When they have once renounced the hope of paying off large portions of debt in a short time, they will become impatient of burdens which are not compensated by brilliant results. When sound economy coincides with immediate convenience it will almost certainly prevail.

#### PRACTICAL JOKES.

THE House of Commons and the country have been very much interested in the story of the tattooing of a young midshipman's nose, and telegrams for a day or two have flown with rapidity and frequency between Plymouth and the metropolis. It was reported at the beginning of the week that a youthful novice had been lashed to a gun by his cruel messmates, that Her Majesty's broad arrow had been cut with a knife upon his nose, and that gunpowder had afterwards been rubbed in, with the view, we suppose, of rendering the mark indelible. Such alarming intelligence took the Admiralty by storm. The old salts at the Board were perhaps less alarmed for the safety of the service than they dared, in the First Lord's presence, to pretend; but the ruling powers felt that the opportunity had at last arrived, to which they had been looking forward so long, of showing the unexampled vigour and despatch of the Admiralty. Mr. Corry's hour was come. With a promptitude worthy of the palmiest days of the Board he at once dismissed the alleged culprit from the service; and the claims of justice thus satisfied by the punishment of two offenders who had never been tried, it seems to have occurred to him that the next step to be taken was to send down two naval captains to investigate the circumstances of the case. In spite of its energy and activity the unhappy Admiralty has had its usual bad luck. The consequences of the inversion of the ordinary method of judicial inquiries in this country, and the substitution of a plan by which wicked midshipmen were sentenced first and tried afterwards, were that a reaction set in in favour of the wicked midshipmen. An official telegram came up from the *Phæbe* to say that it was "wholly untrue that gunpowder had been rubbed in." Other apologists wrote to inform the public that the owner of the injured nose had been a "consenting" party to its embroidery, and liked the pattern chosen. We do not know whether Mr. Corry has ever read *Midshipman Easy*; probably not. We can imagine accordingly the perplexity of the First Lord and his Board at having to deal with this embarrassing plea of "leave and license"; and we have no doubt but that the legal advisers of the Board have been by this time consulted on the point whether such consent ought or ought not by the law of the land to be in writing. And, to crown all, Sir William Gall-

wey has come to the rescue of the dismissed midshipmen, and maintains that nose-tattooing is a "custom in the service." Every one, according to Sir William Gallwey, always tattoos everybody else's nose. The young midshipman, like good champagne, is known by the brand. *Nosctur a naso*. After reading this remarkable assertion, the only thing left for a curious inquirer was to rush down to the National Portrait Gallery and to examine in chronological order the noses of the naval heroes there, in order to study the antiquity of the custom. Without disputing Sir William Gallwey's position as to the existence of the time-honoured habit of nose-tattoo we must, after careful examination, be allowed to say that the brand seems, in the case of many of our greatest heroes, to have worn away later in life. But it is fair to add that the story took at first an exaggerated shape. As far as the *Phæbe's* midshipmen are concerned, it would appear that they performed the painful operation, not merely with real skill, but with absolute humanity. "Only a slight scratch was made, without gunpowder, and after it was done it was hardly perceptible." It is true, therefore, that in compliance with the "established custom in the navy" a broad arrow, "about the size of a horsebean," was cut; but there was no gunpowder, no cayenne pepper, and no barbarity at all, and everything was done to make the necessary performance—which is only, we infer, a species of marine vaccination—as pleasant and as agreeable to the patient as to the operator. After this explanation the Admiralty has done well to be appeased and to reinstate the midshipmen. Pricked, but unpeppered, the nose of the anonymous victim will before long recover, and harmony and peace will once more reign in the mess-room of the *Phæbe*, if indeed it has ever been disturbed.

It is quite true that nothing is more important than the suppression of any practical joking among officers, either in the army or in the navy, which takes the form of personal insolence or systematic annoyance. Since duelling has been abolished, an unpopular newcomer, in a regiment or in a ship, would be at the mercy of any overbearing little messroom clique, unless strict and severe justice were at once dealt out by the authorities upon such offences as were brought under their notice. Nose-tattoo in particular is a custom which even Sir William Gallwey must admit is at least as much honoured in the breach as in the observance. But, in the first place, it must be recollected that the navy is not the army. Midshipmen are mere boys, while ensigns and lieutenants may be taken, as a rule, to have arrived at the dignity of full-feathered manhood; and a practical joke in a middie's mess-room, however rough and ready, is not quite the same as a practical joke in a military barrack. From time immemorial there has been a difference between the two services, and though every midshipman is taught to consider himself an officer and a gentleman, he is only a gentleman in the mitigated sense in which Eton boys are gentlemen as well. He is not expected to be on the *qui vive* to resent a little rude horse-play, any more than it is necessary for the honour of a schoolboy to present a formal remonstrance to the authorities in case he is the victim of a Dutch bed or of a cold pig. We do not say that the authorities can overlook a complaint once made. And the Admiralty's disapproval of practical joking is a fault on the right side, which does them no discredit, but rather the reverse; and will at any rate have the result of brushing up the discipline of the Horse Guards. Still a practical joke among middies is not a practical joke among men. It is hardly worth while converting a boyish prank into a national and Parliamentary affair. As it turns out that no real harm or annoyance in the case of the *Phæbe* was meant or done, as the nose tattoo was not part of a system of disgraceful bullying, and as nothing more than a thoughtless folly was really committed, the Admiralty has been able, without loss of honour, to relax the severity of its first sentence. As they would say—*Sal patriæ Priamœque datum*. Enough has been done to vindicate the honour of the nation and of anxious fathers of families.

The point at which practical joking becomes a serious offence is, as we have hinted, where it passes from the category of boyish fun to that of intentional personal annoyance. It is because practical joking among grown-up people seldom can be anything else but this latter that it ought to be, and as a rule is, discountenanced among them. The rule, however, is not inflexible, and there are degrees of latitude which may be recognised in its application. A practical joke is occasionally the only way of exposing ignorance, or vanity, or vulgarity. When this is the case, it amounts to a *jeu d'esprit* at the expense of some social pretender who can only be punished in some such way; and nobody would feel inclined to judge it very harshly. Many amusing literary productions have been practical jokes of this pardonable kind. Horace Walpole's Prussian letter was an intellectual exploit in point. And the trick played by George Steevens (who by his very similar malicious performances obtained the sobriquet of Puck the Commentator) upon the antiquary Gough, who was at the time of the trick the Director of the Antiquarian Society, is one with which most persons are equally familiar. Possibly it suggested the hoax which six or seven years ago took in the *Morning Advertiser*, and amused London for half a day. Steeven's joke consisted in the preparation of a tombstone on which was engraved a drinking-horn of Hardicanute, with a half legible tracing of the Danish name. After colouring it so as to give it a fictitious air of antiquity, Steevens placed it in a broker's shop to which the Director of the Antiquarian Society was in the habit of resorting. In due time the Director found out the fictitious relic, purchased it with avidity,

and made arrangements for an elaborate essay upon it for the *Archæologia*, which were only stopped by the timely confession of the fraud. A practical joke of this description seems harmless and venial enough. The difficulty is to draw the line between a pardonable fraud of this sort, and the graver misdemeanour of positive literary forgery. Yet the two things are clearly distinct. No one except the victim of the jest could seriously blame Steevens, while a Psalmanazar is rightly considered an offender of a very different class. The motive of Steevens was simply to expose the pretended wisdom of the antiquaries, just as Sir Cornwall Lewis, shortly before his death, wished to raise a laugh at a system of interpreting Oriental inscriptions which he thought untrustworthy. But Psalmanazar's curious and ingenious forgery of the language, religion, and literature of the Formosans was a conspiracy which had for its object, not merely the mystification of the literary world, but the gain and advancement of the two conspirators who hatched it. Psalmanazar's honour, like the honour, in our own times, of the mysterious Simonides, was deeply involved in the genuineness of the manuscripts which he produced to the world. Psalmanazar, therefore, is not an instance of a practical joker, but of an impostor. If a scholar has a right to play on the credulity of mankind, he has not the right to play on it for purposes of pecuniary advantage to himself. We are, however, far from thinking that a scholar has any such right at all, even where no personal end is to be attained. The true test of the morality of a literary hoax is far more severe and strict. Literary forgeries cannot be excused except when they are merely meant to show up to the light of day the ignorance of impostors and charlatans. To deceive the world at large is neither a meritorious nor a very difficult matter. "It requires," says Mr. Disraeli in his *Curiosities of Literature*, "no high exertion of genius to draw up a grave account of an ancient playwright whose name has never reached us, or to give an extract from a volume inaccessible to our inquiries." A traveller who chose to fabricate for the *Times* newspaper an account of a visit to an Indian temple which never existed would not prove himself thereby a wit, or a man of intellectual power. His lie would neither bring discredit on those who believed it, nor credit to himself. To be justifiable, such fictions must first of all be such as to deceive nobody except the veriest pretender to scientific attainments, and their sole object must be to hoist charlatans with their own petard. This distinction is one which the silly authors of literary hoaxes never can be made to see. The veriest donkey can send a telegram to Printing House Square to say that Lord Brougham is dead, or that the Atlantic Cable is again broken; but such an achievement would be wanting in the only ingredients which make a lawful literary hoax different from a mean and contemptible falsehood.

We have been led to make these remarks by the appearance during the last week in the English press of a second practical joke far more disgraceful than the nose-tattooing on board the *Phæbe*—a practical joke which contains every possible element in it that makes a practical joke vulgar, offensive, and discreditable. Some West of England paper—which will, we trust, explain its connexion with the anecdote—recently published a piece of intelligence to the effect that Her Majesty had determined to bestow half-a-million sterling upon a London hospital. The first thing to observe about such a hoax is that it is absolutely stupid and childish. Anybody who had the opportunity of promulgating safely, and without risk of personal detection, such an assertion might of course do so, and be believed, until his story was contradicted by the few persons who could do so with authority. There is no reason why any one should be ashamed of accepting the falsehood in the first instance as true. Its wide circulation reflects no shadow of dishonour on the credulity of the world. It exposes no literary charlatan, it raises the laugh at no impostor. The story is nothing better than a lie; and, unless a horse-dealer's lie about a horse or a grocer's lie about a chest of tea is a clever and witty joke, the lie about the Queen's charitable donation is not either clever, witty, or jocular. In the second place, the sole object of the hoax—if hoax it can be called—has been to annoy and vex those about whom it was invented. And lastly, this annoyance and vexation was meant to be inflicted on a woman who cannot protect herself against such unmanly cowardice, and who has done nothing to deserve it. Against the anonymous malice of a ruffian there is of course no remedy; but when practical joking takes this form, it does not deserve condign punishment the less because it often succeeds in escaping it. Anybody can chalk up an impertinence upon a door and run away. Anybody can fling mud at a passing carriage and make off down the nearest alley. This is precisely what the originator of the silly fraud to which we refer has done. Probably it would not be impossible to discover the offender, but it is equally probable that, when discovered, he would turn out to be some poor creature to whom a ducking in a horse-pond would not really be a serious indignity. The occurrence will, we trust, be sufficient to call attention to the vulgarity and uselessness of such brilliant and ingenious literary jokes, which are not, we regret to say, becoming less common in this country as newspapers increase in number and in circulation. If there were nothing else to be said against them, it is desirable that the authors of them should learn to appreciate the fact that literary hoaxes ought at least to have some literary merit. There is nothing more ludicrous, except indeed when it results in mischief, than the forced and dull facetiousness of an ass. The ass in *Æsop's* fable who took upon himself to amuse his master by his



gambels received as his only reward a sound cudgelling, and though the cudgel in the present case will possibly be dispensed with, we cannot congratulate the press of the West of England on their possession amongst them of a romping donkey.

## BRITISH RESERVE.

ENGLISHMEN habitually speak of the icy reserve which is supposed to be one of our national characteristics in the spirit in which most national characteristics are discussed by those in whom they are exemplified. They speak, that is, as though they were not quite certain whether it is a disagreeable virtue for which they are bound to apologize, or an amiable vice of which they may be permitted to boast. As it is supposed to be a pre-eminently English quality, it is to be mentioned with a due mixture of grumbling and congratulation, which equally imply a good solid substratum of self-complacency. We feel the sort of pride which soothes the owner of a queer-tempered bulldog; the beast is not amiable, but the consciousness of having an incarnate growl at his disposal gives his master a certain additional dignity. There is a good illustration of this national peculiarity in *Eothen*, where two English travellers coming from opposite points of the compass meet each other on their camels in the midst of the desert. They are passing as coolly as if Pall Mall had been the scene of their encounter, until the more sociable propensities of their camels or their Arab servants force them into communication. Many similar anecdotes pass current abroad as illustrations of our manners, and are still more frequently put into the mouth of that hypothetical "intelligent foreigner" in whose feigned existence we so often find a responsible editor of our criticisms of ourselves. If two Englishmen escape alone in a boat from a shipwreck, they are supposed not to speak, unless they have been previously introduced. Or if any number who have not undergone that mystic ceremony are left together in a room, they will, it is believed, be found in due time arranged with mathematical precision, so that the average distance of every man from all his companions may be a maximum. Like other sayings about national character, this is far from being a universally accurate statement; the very fact that it has passed into a commonplace is a presumption that it expresses a superficial or a partial view of the case. There is scarcely any popular saying about a nation which does not require to be considerably modified. It is a frequently recurring English superstition that, as the French have no word for "home," and have only one word for wife and woman, they must be weak in their domestic affections; whereas, in many respects, they are certainly more tenacious of domestic relations than ourselves. On the other hand, we continue to hold that the French are the most polite nation in Europe; although it is certain that, however true this may be of French gentlemen in all classes, no men can be more rude and more totally regardless of other people's feelings than those Frenchmen, and they are not unfrequently who are in no sense gentlemen. The truth is that the various shades of character by which nations are distinguished from each other have not been classified and named with sufficient accuracy to admit of any very unqualified statement about them. Every nation, for example, holds itself to be pre-eminently brave, and embodies this doctrine in the concrete assertion that no other nation can meet it with the bayonet, whatever it may do at long ranges. This latter superstition can, of course, only hold true in one case; but the word "brave" may cover so many different qualities with only a general resemblance that it is quite possible that every European nation may excel in one particular variety. In like manner, the assertion that Englishmen are remarkable for reserve requires to be at least qualified, and to be stated subject to certain reservations and distinctions. The theory that travelling Englishmen will not speak to each other seems to be specially unfounded. At a foreign *table d'hôte* the chances are that the English element coalesces enough for conversational purposes, whilst the Germans are absorbed in attention to their food, and Frenchmen are oppressed by that extreme discomfort to which the travelling Frenchman is always a helpless prey. The British snob abroad would be more generally accused of too great forwardness than of an undue reserve—a circumstance, however, which might be accounted for by the horror with which men naturally watch his smallest approaches to familiarity. The reverse of this case may be noticed in the popular creed about Americans. It is generally held that every American whom you meet puts you through a deliberate cross-examination. He is expected to inquire as to your name, your profession, the places from which you are coming and to which you are going, and all those subjects upon which the impertinent curiosity of a foreign Government interrogates travellers in hotel-books. This theory is not altogether false; for, doubtless, when a communication has once been opened, the ordinary American is not apt to be hampered by too refined considerations of an overstrained delicacy. But it is quite a mistake to suppose that a traveller has to run this gauntlet of questions frequently. As has been remarked by Mr. Trollope and Mr. Sala, amongst late tourists, the very reverse is nearer the truth. A railway carriage in America is generally as silent as a Quaker's meeting. A man may travel for hours together in crowded "cars" without having a word addressed to him, and the reason is obvious. When all classes are mixed together in one carriage in a country where the outward casing of a bishop or a judge is much like that of a day-labourer or a pickpocket, there are plain reasons for caution. The greatest provocation to

talk is where a small party are pretty certain of finding a common subject of interest, without too wide a divergence of opinion. The provocation reaches its minimum when a miscellaneous crowd is brought together from the four corners of heaven, and when every man is so like his neighbour that there is no chance of their sorting themselves into suits. Two men meeting accidentally in an English carriage, with black coats and white ties, might probably begin to talk about schools or churches, especially if their waist-coats were of the same cut; but if each of them were clad in American fashion, in garments of no distinctive cut or colour, they might never hit upon the connecting topic. Even a general thirst for knowledge and a republican indifference to etiquette are insufficient to break down the conventional barrier which naturally grows up under the system of indiscriminate jumblement.

This result suggests that some of the reserve for which Englishmen have got credit may be due to similar causes. Certain peculiarities of English society suggest some obvious reasons for a very general desire to keep our neighbours at arm's length. There is a certain group of qualities which is generated by temporary necessities, and which every society acquires at a particular stage of its progress. Hospitality, for example, is merely another name for absence of inns. It is an artificial contrivance, which for a time enables praise to do the work of pudding. A strong demand for any virtue will in time be pretty certain to secure a supply. If it is necessary for picking pockets that there should be a certain amount of honour among thieves, thieves will not let their profession suffer from too scrupulous a dislike to virtue in the abstract. Theologians have decided that there must be some confidence even in the infernal regions, since otherwise the permanence of the establishment could not be secured. Thus public opinion contrives to enforce hospitality until it becomes more convenient to secure the result by other means. The degree of reserve which exists between travellers is regulated in the same way. To meet on the Zambesi is an introduction of itself; for, in such cases, travellers need each other's help and society; but to meet on a railway establishes no more claim upon your acquaintance than to be born in the same world—most things human being, if not alien to us, at least bores in practice. The Arab, it is said, when he receives the stranger hospitably, thinks it a point of etiquette not to inquire into his family; he fears to discover the presence of an enemy, whose throat must be cut in obedience to some imperative code of honour. That danger scarcely exists in making casual acquaintance in England; but there still remains the danger of discovering a man whose familiarity would be more or less insulting. It is evident that this danger increases in proportion to the variety of social distinctions and the extent to which members of different classes are intermingled. As England is a country where both of these conditions exist in a high degree, it is no wonder that reserve should grow into a second nature. In a town where the social scale includes every variety of mankind between a duke and a "casual," and where the population is so thoroughly shaken together that the casual may at any moment tread on the duke's toes, such an etiquette becomes a necessity. The existence of a sometimes over-stringent reserve is the penalty which we pay for being members of the largest, the most varied, and the most stirring society in the world. A man who takes an active part in the fray must case himself in good sound defensive armour. The same circumstance explains why Englishmen abroad are, if anything, less given to stiffness than their neighbours. Travelling has not yet become so universal an amusement but that the large majority of visitors to Switzerland or Italy belong to approximately the same social stratum. They are drawn, at any rate, from the same ranks sufficiently to render intercourse easy and a temporary companionship agreeable. And we are, therefore, generally delighted to lay aside for a time the system of social regulations with which we habitually surround ourselves. The society from which reserve would be most completely banished would be one like the old French aristocracy, of which all the members were on terms of perfect equality, and which was divided by deep demarcations from the external world. Reserve was unnecessary towards those who were outside the pale, and out of place towards those within it.

When this peculiarity, which is almost essential in our social relations, is carried into private life, it is doubtless less amiable. The man who is separated by an impassable barrier of ice from all his acquaintance certainly helps to make the world less agreeable. Even in this case, however, it is not to be denied that it is a quality which has some compensating advantages, especially to the proprietor. The thoroughly affable man suffers many things, because of bores and the other plagues of society, from which his more reserved neighbour is happily free. Sleep, we know, wraps a man up like a cloak, which is one of its great recommendations. And in your waking moments, when the bore is abroad, it is a blessing to be able to put on the cloak of reserve, which may act as an efficient non-conducting medium between him and you. It is true that no composition hitherto discovered has been able to resist the terrible attacks of the genuine bore in his full development; still he fastens more freely upon the less reserved of mankind, and any palliative is in such a case better than nothing. And, even in regard to others than bores, there are occasions when a modified indulgence of the malevolent passions is not altogether disagreeable, and a power of keeping one's best friends at arm's length is pleasant in a temporary fit of misanthropy. It acts as a healthy astringent, checking that undue flow of gushing sentiment which will sometimes occur in the best-regulated minds.

## THE APOTHEOSIS OF PARIS.

**M** VICTOR HUGO has blown a Titanic trumpet-blast inviting mankind to Paris, and instructing them what is that Paris with which they are to be brought face to face. Accustomed as that immortal city is to lavish adoration and ecstatic idolatry, all previous liturgies strike cold and tame on the ear compared with this latest and loudest outburst of devotion. The incense does not float delicately forth from golden censers, but steams up in great hot clouds as from vast and bottomless cauldrons. The offerings on the altar are nothing less than the whole human race and the entire future of humanity; all belongs to Paris, and lies in the hollow of her hand to mould and fashion as she will. She sums up all that has been. She contains all that is to come. As we English have fallen into a silly fashion of self-disparagement, it may act as a useful tonic to contemplate the attitude of a nation which profoundly admires itself, and which has no school-girl shame of confessing its intense complacency and self-satisfaction. On the whole, we prefer the extravagant enthusiasm of the worshippers of the great goddess of the Parisians—she is certainly not Diana—to the sheepish abasement of Englishmen who are always blushing for their country, without ever putting forth their hands to help her to rise to something higher than she is. M. Hugo presents us with the dominant passion of France in its most gigantic form. National vanity in him assumes superhuman dimensions and most portentous shape. In him therefore we may study it at its largest, and, we may add, at its best. For M. Victor Hugo is invariably and deeply humane, pacific, and progressive. Every page that he has ever written is penetrated with a passionate sympathy for the suffering, the helpless, and the miserable. If he too vehemently wishes to replace Providence by Paris as the seat and organ of the government of the universe, at least he means Paris to be the representative of all that is noble and compassionate. We may forgive much swelling of the cheeks and loud exaltations of the voice to one who has never exalted his voice except in the cause of humanity. Still this cannot prevent us from recognizing the astounding excess and paradox into which he is led by the vehemence of his nature, and by the tenacious hold which national sentiment has taken upon his whole character.

The simple theory on which M. Hugo has constructed his most recent composition is that Paris is to the nation of the Future what the head is to the body. In the twentieth century there will be an extraordinary nation. To this nation a battle between Italians and Germans, between English and Russians, between French and Prussians, will appear very much what a battle between Picards and Burgundians appears to us. It will have some difficulty in understanding the difference between a butcher and a general. As we lift our hands in horror and amazement at the history of the Inquisition, it will lift its hands at the thought of war. It will feel for authority about the amount of respect which we feel for orthodoxy. A prosecution of a newspaper will strike it as a trial for heresy strikes us. "*Aux fleuves frontières succéderont les fleuves artères.*" And so forth. In a word, there is to be a millennium. "Le continent fraternel, tel est l'avenir. Qu'on en prenne son parti, cet immense bonheur est inévitable." Of this people, which as yet exists not, the capital does exist. This seems a miracle; it is a law. The fetus of nations acts as does that of man; and the mysterious construction of the embryo always begins with the head. The reader with the meanest capacity will understand that all this points to Paris. There have been three cities in history—Jerusalem, Athens, Rome—*les trois villes rythmiques*. The ideal is blended of three rays—the True, the Beautiful, the Great. From each of these cities one of these three irradiates. Among them they make the light. Are they dead, these great cities? No; the broken egg-shell means the end of the egg, but the life of the bird. Rome is gone, but the idea of power lives. Athens is in ruins, but art survives. Jerusalem has fallen, but liberty remains. Besides they all live again in Paris. Of the three cities she is the sum. "Ce logarithme de trois civilisations rédigées en une formule unique, cette pénétration d'Athènes dans Rome, et de Jérusalem dans Athènes, cette tétralogie sublime du progrès faisant effort vers l'Idéal, donne ce monstre et produit ce chef-d'œuvre—Paris." All this, we should say, constitutes the introduction to a new and very elaborate *Paris Guide*, to which some of the most eminent of French writers have contributed. What will the German or British tourist feel when he is told that the Paris at which he has just arrived is "a logarithm of three civilizations reduced to a simple formula—a sublime piece of the tetralogy of progress"? It is not so much an affront to one's national vanity, as an enigma to perplex one's understanding. However, most people will be inclined to think that calling Paris a logarithm is as harmless as the old joke of calling the angry fish-wife an isosceles triangle. It does not mean very much more, we suspect. The tourists will learn other things which they may find more intelligible, but more unpleasant to their self-love. "Why have all these people come to Paris?" the writer asks. The answer is really sublime. "Ils viennent être France. . . Ils viennent s'incorporer à la civilisation. Ils viennent comprendre." Who have thus come to be France? "Ce qui arrive, ce qui accourt, ce qui s'empresse, c'est le vieux Thibet fanatique, c'est le Kolkar, le Travancore, le Bhopal, le Drangudra, le Punwah, le Chattrupore, l'Attipore, le Gundul, le Ristlom; c'est le Jam de Norvanaghur, c'est le Nizam de Hyderabad, c'est le Kao de Rusk, c'est le Thakore de Morwée." All these astounding peoples are supposed

to be in Paris, with a view to incorporating themselves with civilization. The distant dawn of *droit humain*, or rather *Droit Humain*, "a blanchi leur sombre horizon." The French Revolution has shed a long track of light which has reached even them. These barbarians know that there is a city like the sun (*une ville soleil*); they know that there exists a people of reconciliation, an abode of democracy, an open nation which invites whoever is or wishes to be a brother. Possibly the "unique formule" by which the French have been too much accustomed to invite men to brotherhood—"Sois mon frère ou je te tue"—has reached the ears of the Kao of Rusk, of the Thakore of Morwée, and of the Jam of Norvanaghur, but it has not in a general way been placed before them in a manner which would make them particularly anxious to visit the birthplace of the formula. Every rude race which has had to deal with the sons of reconciliation has found them even more unpleasant than the British have been at their worst, though that is bad enough to look back upon. We doubt whether an Algerian, a Mexican, or a Cochinchinese, has quite realized that the French are a people of reconciliation, or learnt that any remarkable practical advantages accrue to the subjects of the "maison de démocratie." M. Hugo insists that they are in mysterious communion with the French conscience. Do they read Montaigne, Pascal, Molière, Diderot? No, but they breathe them. "Phénomène magnifique, cordial et formidable, que cette volatilisation d'un peuple qui s'évapore en fraternité." We should take a good deal more pleasure in this eloquent and patriotic glorification of France if we could forget that not more than six weeks ago the impatient "susceptibilities" of this people of reconciliation, this people which volatilizes itself and evaporates in brotherhood, were on the verge of throwing Europe into a war which would have been one of the most senseless and bloody that the world ever saw. Probably M. Victor Hugo would explain the lamentable restlessness of his countrymen by the abnormal and fretting character of the Government under which they exist. If they had a régime of nobler and loftier principles they might, it is true, be more likely to exhibit a nobler and loftier mood in the face of the internal triumphs of foreign nations. However this may be, a glorification of the French love of peace grates unpleasantly on the ear so soon after their preposterous irritability had so nearly plunged Europe into war. Still it can do no harm, at all events, for a great writer like M. Hugo to denounce Armstrong guns. Death, he laments, has been admitted into the Exhibition; it enters in the shape of cannon, but does not enter in the shape of guillotine; *c'est une délicatesse*. A very fine scaffold, he tells us, was offered, but refused, and this may be taken for a sign of improvement, so far as it goes. "Les machines de meurtre ne sont ici que pour faire ombre. Elles ont honte, on le voit. L'exposition, apothéose pour tous les autres outils de l'homme, est pour elles pilori. Passons."

The Exhibition has another defect. There will be wanting in this august palace what would have given it a supreme significance—four colossal statues at the four corners, representing four incarnations of the Ideal; Homer representing Greece, Dante representing Italy, Shakespeare representing England, Beethoven representing Germany, "and in front of the entrance, stretching forth a hand to all mankind—a fifth colossus, Voltaire, representing, not the genius of France, but the spirit of universal mankind." It may be the result of vile English isolation and conceit, but we cannot help thinking that either Shakespeare or Goethe would have done better than Voltaire as the colossal type of "l'esprit universel." Perhaps it would be too much to expect to see in Paris anybody but a Frenchman set up as the leader and guide of mankind. Even in this case it is clear that Voltaire has an indisputable claim to the first place? In one respect there is a very sound principle in the selection of Voltaire. He is not exalted because he is a great artist, but as a practical friend of humanity. M. Hugo, we suspect, holds the artist comparatively cheap. It is the man who cares for his fellows whom he would exalt. Here he is right. The majestic serenity of the artist comes second, and by a long interval, after the active enthusiasm of the practical philosopher. The creator of artistic beauty stands below a puissant promoter of social justice. M. Hugo places Voltaire third in what he styles "a trinity of reason," along with Rabelais and Molière. "Ce triple éclat de rire, gaulois au seizième siècle, humain au dix-septième, cosmopolite au dix-huitième, c'est Paris!" Everything goes in threes, it will be perceived. Paris is Athens, Rome, Jerusalem. It is the Beautiful, the True, the Grand. It is Rabelais, Molière, Voltaire. It is French, human, cosmopolitan. Finally, "Paris is not a city, it is a government. Whoever you are, here is your master. I defy you to wear any hat but the hat Parisian. The ribbon of that woman who has just passed governs. In every country the fashion of tying that ribbon is law. *Le boy de Blackfriars copie le gamin de la rue Grenetat.*" This is really very quaint. We may admit that the ribbon of the Parisian woman establishes a law for the ribbons of all other women. But we will cheerfully encounter the poet's defiance in the matter of the Parisian hat. And as for "*le boy de Blackfriars*"—are "*les boys de Blackfriars*," by the way, particularly remarkable among boys?—we venture to think that he obeys the simple inspiration of nature, just as the gamin of Paris does. But this is a common fault. If you love your country, then vow that every characteristic of human nature which you find elsewhere is due, not to human nature, but to the impression made by your own country. All divisions of country, however, will soon be effaced. "France," exclaims M. Hugo in an impassioned peroration,



est trop grande pour n'être qu'une patrie. Encore un peu de temps, et tu t'évanouiras dans la transfiguration... tu ne seras plus France; tu seras Humanité; tu ne seras plus nation, tu seras ubiquité. . . . Résigne-toi à ton immensité. Adieu, Peuple! Salut, Homme! Subis ton élargissement fatal et sublime, ô ma patrie, et de même qu'Athènes est devenue la Grèce, de même que Rome est devenue la Chrétienté, toi France, deviens le monde!

## CLERGYMEN IN PARLIAMENT.

PROFESSOR ROGERS has published, in the current number of *Fraser's Magazine*, a paper on a subject which some day or other must attract the attention of the Legislature. Some twenty thousand subjects of the Crown—men of the highest education, with very few exceptions possessed of some means, all of them peaceable, taxpaying folk, and especially interested in the social, moral, and religious welfare of the country, and from their peculiar position, as mixing freely with all classes of the community, likely to be unusually well acquainted with the general needs of the commonwealth—are debarred from a privilege, or right, the withholding of which from a single profession is in fact a wrong to the whole community. For when Parliament chooses to say to the clergy of the Church of England, You shall not sit in the House of Commons, this is equivalent to the denial to every constituency of freedom in the choice of its representatives. The question, therefore, of the eligibility of the clergy to the House of Commons resolves itself into the freedom of the electors. Could the question be once brought to this issue it would soon be decided. Wilkes was expelled from Parliament, but the electors of Middlesex were too strong for Parliament. O'Connell's election for Clare destroyed the disabling statutes against Roman Catholics. Jewish disabilities fell, like the walls of Jericho, before the perseverance of the citizens of London. It wants, as a matter of fact, but the election of a single clergyman to brush away the spiteful Act of 1801. Professor Rogers has done good service to the cause of constitutional principles by recalling the circumstances under which this statute was passed. It was carried at a time when liberal feeling was at its lowest ebb, when the whole nation was prostrated by not unreasonable fears of invasion; and by one of the weakest Ministers the Crown ever had, for Addington could never have held office for a month except in the paralysis of patriotism. Moreover, it was specially directed as a personal affront and insult—for it did not deprive him of his seat—against Horne Tooke, whose moral character was such that he could attract few friends among decent people, and in prosecuting whom the Government were glad to retaliate in a small way their defeat in Wilkes's much more important case. The high-handed and imperious way in which Addington and his supple supporters carried their measure is something curious to look back upon. Precedent was decidedly against the restriction. As late as 1785 a Committee of the House of Commons had, upon petition, seated a Mr. Rushworth, who had received deacon's orders; and the leading case on the other side, which pronounced in 1553 on Mr. Newell's disability, went upon the ground that he had a voice—that is, was a proctor—in Convocation; but that was when Convocation had the right of taxing the clergy. In Craddock's case, whose election for Richmond was declared void on the double ground of his ordination and of a majority against him on the poll, it does not appear that the case was argued; and, anyhow, it is confronted by the subsequent decision in Rushworth's case.

The grounds upon which Addington and his colleagues justified the disabling statute are transparently inadequate. First, they alleged the Parliamentary precedent, as a matter of historical fact, of the ineligibility of the clergy, although in the preamble to the Act they more wisely referred to "doubts" on the subject. And, next, they attempted to establish a political and social principle. They had two bow-strings—the law and the policy of the proposed exclusion. As to the law, they had to get over the fact that before the Reformation most of the education of the country was in the hands of the clergy, and that Parliament was glad enough to get the aid of bishops and abbots; while the fact of the presence of spiritual persons, as a separate estate of the Realm, in the House of Lords at the present day, shows that the Constitution does not regard the spiritual function as inconsistent with legislative capacity. And as to the indelibility of orders, which was urged as a ground for the exclusion of ordained persons from the House of Commons, little argument is needed to show that this doctrine was absolutely beside the point at issue. To have any avail, it must be held that a seat in Parliament is a business or profession. A clergyman by receiving holy orders receives, according to this doctrine of indelibility, a spiritual character which, according to the canons, disables him from pursuing a secular calling, engaging in trade, or the like. It may be that this doctrine, put in its extremest form, prevents a clergyman from renouncing his spiritual state and taking to a secular calling; but what has this to do, if it be ever so true, with his combining political functions with his ecclesiastical character? Did Addington pretend that a seat in Parliament was a lucrative calling? Just after the Union he might have done so, but it would scarcely have been prudent to take this ground. Not so many years before, a Bishop, Robinson, had been appointed Lord Privy Seal, a Lord of Trade, and was one of the most active plenipotentiaries in concluding the Peace of Utrecht. But the objection of canonical disability is a mere pretence. The non-jurors, not likely to be very lax on such a point, allowed their crypto-Bishops to practise and take fees as physicians; and at the present moment French and Italian, and we believe Austrian, ecclesi-

astics are eligible, and are elected, to seats in a representative assembly which is much the same thing as Parliament, without let or hindrance on the part either of the State or the Roman Church.

The constitutional and canonical arguments for declaring the ineligibility of clergymen to Parliament being disposed of, there only remains the social and sentimental ground, which was of course the real ground on which Addington's Act was passed. But the days for this sort of thing are gone by. It may be in theory a very bad thing for a sacred personage, such as a clergyman, to entangle himself with such mundane considerations as the Compound Householder and the effects of the Luxemburg Treaty; but this is a matter for the clerical conscience. It is not a consideration with which Parliament has anything to do. If it hinders a man's ghostly advancement to sit in the House of Commons and listen to weary debates, to the neglect of his spiritual calling, it is no less true that his temporal interests may be injured by his absenting himself from his estate or his factory. But Parliament has no more right to compel a parson to attend exclusively to his calling than to impose on a carpet-weaver undivided allegiance to his trade. Attendance in Parliament may be a very soul-destroying employment, but Parliament has no more business to protect the clergy against their own voluntary sacrifice of their souls than to protect the laity against their voluntary sacrifice of time, health, and money for the sake of a seat in the House of Commons. Parliament is not called upon to prevent a man from injuring either his spiritual or temporal welfare. Dismissing, then, the alleged wrong and injustice to the clergy in permitting them to pursue politics as well as polemics, it is, we believe, urged that the general interests of society would suffer were the clergy, with their social influence and position, to be entrusted with the dangerous power of influencing the constituencies. This is an argument not very complimentary to the laity; and, though we are on this occasion arguing from a clerical brief, we scarcely believe that our spiritual clients would, were they fairly pitted with the laity on the hustings, be found to have any great advantage. If anybody seriously believes that the repeal of the Act of 1801 would flood the House of Commons with parsons, we shall not contest his opinion. And as to the dangers of clerical influence, and the possibility of a *parti prêtre* in Parliament, it is fair to urge first that, as the clergy are not a very harmonious body, it is not likely that clerical M.P.'s would represent a single theological school; and further, that even if this extreme consequence followed, it is not quite so clear that a clerical interest in Parliament would be much more baneful to the commonwealth than a railway interest or an Irish interest. Indeed, it may be questioned whether the argument does not rather lean the other way. If it is desired to discourage the feeling of the clergy being a caste, with separate interests and an exclusive devotion to their order, surely it is safest to trust them, like all other citizens, with the common duties, interests, and responsibilities of general society. Priestcraft, whatever that expression may mean, is more likely to be engendered when the clergy are treated as a distinct order, labouring under special and prohibitory disabilities, having no political part nor inheritance in Israel. It is unwise to allow any twenty thousand men to have a political grievance; and at any rate the clergy, being flesh and blood, may well be pardoned if, while everybody else's disabilities have melted away before the increasing liberality of the time, they alone should be ostracized. Symmetry requires the removal of all class disabilities. "Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics," even Papists, being free, why should parsons be bound? But the objections to the repeal of the statute of 1801 are not likely to come from the Liberal party. It is much more probable that those of the clergy who have been most forward in reviving Convocation would feel much of the force of their argument for its activity attenuated or evaporated if clergymen were made eligible to the House of Commons. The only substantial danger which we can anticipate as likely to follow the admission of clergymen into the House of Commons is the possible introduction of all sorts of inconvenient theological discussions, on the plea that the Church would then have accredited and special representatives.

On one point, and on only one, we are at issue with Professor Rogers; for we think that the question of the indelibility or indefeasibility of holy orders, or the propriety of legalizing a formal renunciation of the ecclesiastical status, on which he enlarges, has nothing to do with the political disability of the clergyman to represent boroughs and counties. Where we differ with him is when he contends that the removal of clerical disabilities should be accompanied by the adoption of a compromise suggested by Tooke. Tooke's proposal was to disable any clerical member of Parliament from receiving any benefice in official or Crown patronage; and we have even heard it proposed that the disability should extend to the acceptance of any ecclesiastical preferment whatever after election to the House of Commons. This restriction would surely be very undignified. Granted that clerical M.P.'s might sacrifice their independence with a view to Deaneries and Bishoprics, we must remark that the very same danger exists when lawyers enter St. Stephen's with an anxious eye to the Attorney-Generalship, the Bench, and the Woolsack, or when naval and military senators speak and vote in the presence of the dispensers of Admiralty and Army patronage. No doubt the scandal would be greater if some reverend representative of Wells, Ripon, or Peterborough were to be found very useful in a political crisis, and were soon after to find himself a dignitary, than what now happens when a gallant supporter of Government

gets a regiment or a ship; but if Parliamentary prudery is not shocked by the possibility of an abuse in one case, it is scarcely worth while to be exceptionally rigid in another which only differs from it in degree. If clergymen are to be interdicted from rising in their profession because they happen to sit in Parliament, all the professions must be equally restricted. The clergy are at least not more venal than their neighbours.

#### THE COUNCIL OF INDIA.

A CONSTITUTIONAL question of very grave importance has recently been raised in the House of Commons, and as it is connected with what from its very nature is necessarily the most anomalous of all anomalies, our Indian Government, it cannot be set at rest by any appeal to the pages of Hallam or the wisdom of our ancestors. It has arisen in a conflict between the Council of India and the Secretary of State, and thus strikes at the root of the principle and the mainspring of the machinery by which our vast dependency is governed. It is hardly possible therefore to raise a question of more vital moment, and we make no excuse for devoting a larger space than usual to its consideration. The collision arose in this way. Lord Cranborne, it will be remembered, a few days before his resignation of office, in reply to a question from Sir Henry Rawlinson, had announced to the House of Commons that it was "not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to annex Mysore on the death of the Maharajah," but that the adopted son was to be recognised as his heir, and, when the time came, placed in possession of such a measure of authority as should appear right to those who might then be charged with the responsibility of the Government of India. The announcement was received with loud cheers by the House of Commons, and met with the general approbation of the country, although some doubts were expressed as to the change of policy being too sudden to be altogether satisfactory. That this suspicion was unfounded we are now glad to learn from the Minute of Sir Erskine Perry, who tells us that Lord Cranborne, "soon after he took office," and many months before the subject was noticed in Parliament, had written a letter "in the Secret Department" to the Governor-General, directing that, on the death of the Maharajah, no steps should be taken towards the annexation of Mysore without communication with the Home Government. This letter he felt it necessary to write because Lord Derby's Cabinet had thus early resolved upon a line of conduct in the Mysore case which should distinguish their policy from the less liberal policy of their predecessors; and this we say in spite of what ought to be the high authority of Mr. Stansfeld, who, with an agreeable audacity of assertion for the generation of which the air of the present Session appears favourable, informed the House that he traced "identity of non-annexation policy" in Sir Charles Wood's order to ignore the adoption of the young prince, and in Sir Stafford Northcote's pledge to place him upon the throne! However this may be, the two points with which we are now principally concerned are the undisputed facts that the existence of Lord Cranborne's first letter was not announced to the body of the Council until months after it had been in the hands of the Governor-General; and that the important change of policy communicated to the House of Commons was first made known to the Council by the report of the speech in the columns of the *Times* newspaper. Lord Cranborne is stated to have "frankly acknowledged his inadvertence" with regard to the speech, but does not appear to have made any admission of wrongdoing with regard to the letter. Perhaps time did not admit of it. The speech was delivered on the 22nd of February, and very shortly afterwards Lord Cranborne quitted the Ministry. In the interval—it was the memorable "ten minutes" period—he had not leisure even to prepare the despatch which he had promised to lay upon the table of the House, but had merely noted down the heads of what he had intended to write. These notes he made over to his successor, and they formed the skeleton of that despatch in which Sir Stafford Northcote conveyed to Sir John Lawrence the latest final decision of Her Majesty's Government. And here again there was a clash with the Council. There were fourteen members present, and ten out of these fourteen have entered a formal record of their condemnation of this decision both as to matter and as to manner. One of these—who, as an ex-judge of the Supreme Court of Bombay, may be regarded as the legal member of the body, and indeed was specially nominated with that view—has taken upon himself to affirm that "the law and the constitutional checks imposed by Parliament have been overlooked"; and he further dissents from the policy of the step on the strength of the "good deal" of Mysore and its administration which he had himself seen on "two visits," which we happen to know were exactly such visits as Mr. Cook's "tourists" are paying to France during the present Exhibition. Another member, Sir James Hogg, after a root-and-branch condemnation of the policy, asserts it in effect to be an invention of Sir Stafford's own, in direct opposition to the views of Her Majesty's Ministers, as laid down in the speech of Lord Cranborne. Lord Derby perhaps would have had something to say if this assertion had been true, and Lord Cranborne, so far from thinking that his successor had "ignored all he had said in Parliament," expressly states that the despatch is "entirely coincident with what he had himself suggested." The Minutes of which the above are specimens were laid before Parliament on the call of Lord William Hay, a retired Bengal civilian, and on the 24th of May were the

subject of a long and animated debate, which was wound up by the present and the late Secretaries for India in two speeches of remarkable ability, in which the opposition of the Council was discussed with a force and a clearness which would lose their effect in any attempt at abridgement.

It was Sir Stafford Northcote who spoke first:—

He fully admitted the great importance of the subject which had been brought under their notice by the noble lord. There could be no doubt that this question was of great importance in more than one respect. It was important as it bore upon our policy in India generally, and it was also of importance as affording a crucial case for determining the view which Parliament might take as to the relative position in which the Secretary of State for India and his Council and the Governor of India should stand one to another. As the member for Wick had properly said, the present case was a peculiar and a very strong one, because the Secretary of State for India, not having been previously familiar with the administration of Indian Affairs, found himself immediately on his accession to office engaged in a question of great difficulty, and had taken upon himself, in opposition to the views of the majority of his Council, and, it was said, in opposition to, or at all events not in conformity with the views of his predecessor, to send out a despatch to the Governor-General of India, giving him instructions upon a matter of very great importance. That, undoubtedly, was a step which called for criticism and remark, and he should have had no right to complain had members arisen in that House and found fault with such a proceeding. No one, however, had thought fit to dispute the legality of the course he had adopted, and no one had raised the question whether or not that ought to be the position in which the Secretary of State should stand. It had been generally admitted that if we were to govern India by means of a Secretary of State at all it must be left to the responsible Minister of the day, who must be prepared to defend in Parliament the course he adopted, to decide what should be and what should not be the measures to be taken upon those points which were not specially reserved by Parliament for the decision of other authorities. There could be no doubt that Parliament had distinctly and emphatically reserved certain questions for the decision of the Indian Council; thus questions of expenditure and revenue were determined by that body, and over them the Secretary of State had no power whatsoever. If, therefore, the Secretary of State were to be overruled by his Council on some question of finance, no blame could be attached to him for giving way. But in questions like that at present before the House Parliament had directed that the Secretary of State should have power to act upon his own judgment, notwithstanding he might not have the support of the majority of his Council in the course he might think proper to pursue. Under these circumstances, he had acted upon his own responsibility, and while he admitted the peculiarity and the difficulty of the position in which he had been placed he felt himself justified in saying that no other course was open to him than the course he had adopted—namely, to rely upon his own judgment and to carry out his own views on his own responsibility.

Lord Cranborne still more emphatically followed thus:—

In the first place with regard to the Constitutional question, and the fact that his right hon. friend found himself in the peculiar position of being in opposition to ten out of fourteen of his councillors, he said, very justly, what had been entirely borne out by the general tenor of the debate, that nobody had taken exception to his conduct. He wished to record his own humble opinion in strong approbation of the course his right hon. friend had taken, and he did so not only on the main ground that his right hon. friend's policy was entirely coincident with that which he had himself suggested, but upon broader constitutional grounds. One or two of the dissents which the House had before it written by the Council of India, all very able men, seemed to indicate on the part of those gentlemen—probably, precisely because they were able and competent men—rather a tendency to encroach beyond the sphere which Parliament had assigned them and to touch upon the prerogatives of that House. There ought to be no mistake constitutionally as to the position which the Council of India held. It was a most anomalous institution. It possessed by Act of Parliament an absolute and conclusive veto upon the acts of the Government of the Queen of India with reference to nine out of ten—he would almost say ninety-nine out of every hundred questions. Parliament had provided that it might veto any despatch which directed the appropriation of public money, and every one was aware that almost all questions connected with Government raised questions of expenditure. Upon such questions the Council of India had a conclusive veto, and from that veto there was no appeal except by virtue of an Act of Parliament. Now any one familiar with the constitution of this country would say that that was one of the most anomalous institutions, and the only explanation of it was that the House was so overwhelmed with business nearer home that it had neither time nor opportunity to make itself acquainted with all those matters which could alone enable it to exercise an effectual vigilance over the acts of the Secretary of State for India, and therefore it had created this Council to see that the great powers which had been placed in his hands were not abused. But then it ought to be understood that the moment the House of Commons stepped in, the moment its opinions were expressed upon any subject, that moment the jurisdiction of the Council of India ceased to be. It was not for an instant to be borne that the Council of India should set itself against the opinions of the House of Commons. He said so because there were some very strong opinions expressed in some of those dissents, and they ought not to be allowed to pass without remark. If the opinions embodied in the protests should find their way into action the power possessed by the Council of India would be speedily restricted.

These are words of great weight and significance, conveying ideas statesmanlike in their scope, and formed in a cordial spirit of co-operation. They contrast favourably with the Minutes of the recalcitrant councillors. These gentlemen, indeed, seem hardly to know their own minds; for while in one place the complaint is that their advice has not been followed, it is contracted in another to a whine about its not having been heard. The former is, of course, the real reason of their discontent; but in the very act of urging it they could not fail to see that the ground was at best so weak as hardly to be tenable, and required the support of arguments drawn, not as they ought to have been, from the illegality of the course pursued, but from the want of wisdom of the measure itself. In the latter grievance they very well knew that they had a much better leg to stand upon, but then, unfortunately, they have incidentally admitted that the neglect to consult the Council before taking an important step was a matter of so little moment that a few courteous words were sufficient to remove the irritation it had produced. Besides, in the particular case of Mysore, the complaint was absolutely with-



out foundation in fact; for ever since 1861 the question, in one form or another, has never ceased to be before the Council, and the opinion of each member has been as well known among those interested as the views of Mr. Berkeley on the ballot, or of Beales M.A. on the right of spouting stale sedition in Hyde Park. The only thing to be regretted in the debate was that, owing to the somewhat significant fact of no one rising to speak in the Councilors' behalf, the general question of their position was passed over without that fulness of argument which must have elicited such a marked and decisive expression of the opinion of Parliament as would have set the question at rest for ever.

When the government of India was transferred from the Court of Directors to the Crown, and the Indian Council was constituted in 1858, there were not wanting those who foretold that the system then established would prove cumbersome and obstructive in action. They saw in it at best but a temporary expedient, which would, sooner or later, succumb to public opinion. They declared that, although it was indispensable that Secretaries of State, chosen from among English statesmen who had never been in India and were without practical knowledge of the country, should have at their elbows a body of competent councillors to inform and advise them upon all Indian topics, yet the machinery which had been contrived for that purpose was more likely to work for evil than for good; that if it survived to become a permanent institution it would be found to assume a close family likeness to that kindred Council of the Indies which the wisdom of the Spanish monarchs had established for the ruin of their American dependencies; and that, above all, it far too closely resembled the old Court of Directors both in its elements and its prejudices. It was perhaps inevitable that the greater number of the nominations should fall in the first instance on the members of that body, but it was generally observed among reflecting men that this would infallibly serve to perpetuate that under-current of antagonism which had always more or less existed in the relations of Leadenhall Street and Cannon Row. No Director who had shared in the recall of Lord Ellenborough could ever forget that he had once been a member of a Court which under certain circumstances was vested with extraordinary powers, and that these powers had once been publicly exerted in a manner which led their enemy's predecessor to exclaim, "I am fairly taken by surprise; I did not think John Company had it in him, as Jerry Sneak says of himself." From that time forward *Ego et rex meus* became a mental formula with too many of them, and there were even not wanting some whose state of exultation reminded us of the fly (in the famous simile which George Clerk's Meer Munshi applied to the King of Delhi in 1857) who was perched upon a broken straw floating in the urine of a jackass, and fancied himself an admiral! There is one indeed among the loudest and least coherent of the present dissentients who has so little understood the changed nature of his position that, when examined before the Colonization Committee, he recorded his approbation of the present form of administration on the express ground that it was "conducted by the same men, and on the same principles as before." But there are others of a different order of mind who have long fretted under the subordinate position to which the new order of things has condemned them, and it is to these that Lord Cranborne alludes when he speaks of the "very able men who, probably because they are able and competent men, have rather a tendency to encroach beyond the sphere which Parliament has assigned them, and to trench upon the prerogatives of the House of Commons." To these the Mysore case has afforded the very opportunity that was wanting. It seems, indeed, precisely made to their hands, for no other "concatenation of circumstances" could have been so well calculated for a text to preach from on the possible dangers to which our position in India may be exposed when its inhabitants discover that there is no finality in the decisions of their distant rulers.

We must here leave off, but we hope next week to return to the subject, and to dwell more particularly on the exact legal status of the Council, and the necessity which exists for remodelling or finding a substitute for it.

#### CO-OPERATION AND COMBINATION.

THERE are certain pages in treatises on political economy which will have to be re-written. It has hitherto been held that wages depend upon the demand and supply of labour, or, as it is often expressed, on the proportion between population and capital; that, when several workmen compete for the same employment, wages must fall, and that, when a number of employers are seeking to engage a limited number of workmen, wages must rise. Henceforth, it seems, these axioms must be discarded. The proceedings of the Trades' Unions and the continuance of the tailors' strike disprove their truth. A mode has been discovered by which the rate of wages can be made independent of the number of labourers seeking employment. It is stated that the tailors have had no difficulty in supplying the places of the Union men who struck, by non-Union men from different parts of the country. But it is also stated that these non-Union men have, within a few days after being engaged, been seduced away by the Union men, and that their places have been supplied by other non-Unionists who, in their turn, are also withdrawn. If this statement is generally true (which we are somewhat disposed to doubt), it certainly discloses a very remarkable state of things. For it is calculated that only twenty per cent. of the working tailors

are members of Unions. Thus we have an organization so compact and well administered that it can control the action of men who outnumber its own members in the proportion of four to one. We have said that we rather doubt the statement in its full extent, for we have heard of cases which directly rebut it. But that it is true, in many instances, we do not doubt. And the peculiarity of the phenomenon is that the Unions are put to the expense of maintaining not only their own members who have previously left work, but those others, who are not members, whom they have induced to strike also. It of course now becomes a question of money. On which side are the sinews of war strongest? Can the masters wear out the men, or can the workmen tire out the masters? As between the two, it is a mere question of money. Whichever party succeeds will have inflicted serious scars upon the other. This is the invariable result of all strikes. But there is another result equally certain. There is a third party interested in the dispute, albeit never thought of by either of the disputants—that is, the public; the public which is the paymaster of both. And the public will have to pay the cost of the warfare. If the masters win, their customers will find little items tagged on to their accounts to indemnify the former for the temporary abeyance of work. If the workmen win, the bills will be avowedly increased in order to meet the pressure of enhanced wages. The sooner people begin to reflect on the consequences of strikes to themselves, and to order their affairs accordingly, the better.

We see what these consequences are more conspicuously in other trades than that of tailors. Men are not under any absolute obligation to get their clothes made by a London, or even by an English tailor. At some, but not an insuperable, inconvenience they can be clothed by a French or Belgian tailor. But there are other things which can only be supplied at home. In building, repairing, or decorating houses, native industry must be resorted to. And native industry means the employment of the British Unionist. Now the evidence of Mr. Mault and others shows that, in an age which has witnessed the legislative triumphs of Free-trade, the Trades' Unions have re-established the dynasty of Protection. They have done for themselves and their brethren the same thing which they denounced the Corn Laws for having done on behalf of the landowners. They have created a monopoly in favour of carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, and masons, which is just as unreasonable and as mischievous as that which once existed in favour of the squirearchy. And their pretence is not a whit less plausible. We all remember how at one time it was argued that the existence of a landed aristocracy was so good a thing in itself that a tax should be laid on the whole nation in order to support such a national ornament. The argument, when once boldly stated, met a reception which effectually precluded its repetition. But now the very liberal and philosophical advocates of the working-man tell us that he is quite justified in imposing the tax of a monopoly upon the country, in order to raise the condition of himself and his fellows. That which was selfish, tyrannical, and unjust on the part of the aristocrat, is only an exemplification of dignified self-respect on the part of the labourer. It is just and right that the British public should be taxed to keep up the race of British artisans. It is a commendable self-interest to dodge, threaten, and force involuntary and recalcitrant workmen into a Union; to compel an employer to give the same rate of wages to an idle and listless as to a diligent and efficient workman; to discourage and denounce any example of honourable ambition, or scrupulous exactness, or conscientious delicacy on the part of an artisan as hostile to the workmen's interests; to fitch the tools of a man who will not belong to the Union; to leave a master whom they even suspect of observing whether they are doing their work honestly or not. The following rule of the Bricklayers' Union, which embodies the principle so much applauded by the working-men's advocate, is quoted in the *Times* of Tuesday from the evidence before the Royal Commission on Trades' Unions:—"You are strictly cautioned not to outstep good rules by doing double the work you are required (by the Society), and causing others to do the same, in order to gain a smile from the master. Such foolhardy and deceitful actions leave a great portion of good members out of employment the year round. Certain individuals have been guilty, who will be expelled if they do not refrain." The same evidence contains the following rule of a Leeds Lodge:—"Any brother in the Union professing to carry any more than the common number, which is eight bricks, shall be fined 1s. . . . any member knowing the same shall be fined the same sum." The same evidence also shows that the Bricklayers' Unions throughout England have made rules restricting both the size and the number of bricks which the men are to carry. The common purport of all these rules is to diminish the pressure, to impair the quality, and to extend both the quantity and remuneration of the work done. As organized numbers generally prevail in the end, we may expect to find a more indolent and make-shift, but at the same time more costly, kind of work come into fashion, and its price become double of what it was thirty years ago. And this result will have been brought about by none of the causes to which economists attribute influence, but simply by an energetic resolution and vigorous persistency on the part of the men, a careless or ill-organized resistance on the part of the masters, and a superb indifference on the part of both to their paymaster, the unprotected and unresisting public. This brings us to our moral, which is that the public must learn to protect its own interests. Although it is a very inert and stolid creature, it must at last begin to take trouble.

If it does not, it will find its life made a burden to it. Every expense of life will increase in a geometrical ratio. It is needless to confine its indignation to the proceedings of the workmen's leagues. The workmen have proved themselves apt scholars in a school of which the tradesmen have been the most eminent masters. It was the masters who first showed what a tame and submissive milch cow the "intelligent public" was. The workmen have only tried to draw from the same beneficent udder, and between the two the poor public is drained dry. It is useless to say that the great rise in prices which is complained of by so many is nothing but a general fall in the value of money. This is not so. For wholesale purposes money has the same purchasing power that it had twenty years ago; for some purposes a greater purchasing power. Tea, sugar, and fifty other articles of consumption are sold by the importer, by the broker, by the merchant, at lower prices than would have been given for them in 1847. But—quantity for quantity—they swell the retail-grocer's weekly bill to a higher amount than they did in 1847. It is the same with meat, with fish, with fodder, with furniture, with clothes, and with boots. Lobsters caught in Cornwall are sold, all round, for sevenpence a-piece to the London dealer, and for even a less sum in Scotland. Their carriage adds an inappreciable item to this price. The London dealer sells them never under 2s. 6d. a-piece, sometimes for 3s. 6d. a-piece, and even more. Mackerel have lately been sold by the fishermen at an infinitesimally low price; they constitute a respectable element in the fishmonger's weekly bill for a small household. Fish, more than any other article of consumption, show the capriciousness of the trade greed. While one price is asked in Bond Street, a lower one is asked in Fleet Street, and a still lower in Billingsgate market. Competition has no effect in reducing the prices of things consumed in a large part of London; a combination among the sellers keeps them up. We are the slaves of our butchers, fishmongers, tailors, and boot-makers. Mr. Mill says:—"For such things there often are not merely two, but many prices, in different shops, or even in the same shop; habit and accident having as much to do in the matter as general causes. Purchases for private use, even by people in business, are not always made on business principles. . . . Either from indolence or insouciance, or because people think it fine to pay and ask no questions, three-fourths of those who can afford it give much higher prices than necessary for the things they consume; while the poor often do the same thing from ignorance and defect of judgment, want of time for searching and making inquiry, and, not unfrequently, from coercion, open or disguised." A long impunity in charging high prices, and a long toleration in submitting to them, have encouraged the retail dealers to combine for the spoliation of the public. If an instance is required of the disproportionately high profits which certain kinds of tradesmen persist in exacting, it may be supplied by the tailors. It appears that of the whole sum charged for a suit of clothes, more than half is paid to the tailor, as profit, on a ready-money transaction; in other words, while the materials and the work cost 45 per cent., the profits of the master tailor are not less than 55 per cent. The amusing part of the story is, that while the journeymen tailors throw this in the teeth of the masters, it is for the purpose of denouncing, not their high profits, but their injustice in not letting their workmen share them. To the latter it would appear quite reasonable that the masters should get 120 per cent. profit, if only they themselves got a larger share than they now do. It is to be hoped that some good may yet come of this tailors' strike to the public. It is utterly intolerable that sensible men, who know the value of money, should continue to pay for their clothes more than twice the sum required to buy the material and pay decent wages to the men who make it up, simply because a clique of fashionable shopkeepers chooses to exact these prices, and a mob of ostentatious idiots think it fine to pay them. There is no other excuse or pretext for continuing this practice. The price of each of the items is known, the wages of journeymen are known, and the profit of the masters is known. The worst symptom in the whole affair is the unwillingness of the journeymen themselves to form co-operative establishments, and to earn by their labour for themselves profits higher than the wages which they now receive. If they once made up their minds to this course, they would be abundantly supported by the public. Such little capital as they might require would be forthcoming at once. Whether it is that their organization is only good for resistance and not for co-operation, or that they distrust one another, or for whatever reason, we cannot say; but the fact is that they do prefer helping the masters to plunder the public to earning reasonable profits on their own account. This makes it more important that the public should combine to get their clothes cheaply; and not their clothes only, but other articles also. We are most of us paying fancy prices for things, to our own great loss, and to the advantage of the least public-spirited and independent part of the community. A great and general combination made by the purchasing public, and served by men of sagacity and fidelity, might introduce a more rational system than that which we have long endured. No better time could be imagined than a year darkened by the clouds of a prolonged disaster, for disembarassing our minds of the painful reflection that, in the midst of our distress, we have been paying twice as much as we ought to have paid to a body at once sordidly selfish and impudently greedy.

#### THE REPORT ON ARMY TRANSPORT AND SUPPLY.

**D**EFFECTS in our military system have hitherto been dealt with after a fashion so uniform that the whole course of the proceeding might be predicted with something like certainty. Our first discovery that there is anything wrong is made under the stress of actual war. Some day, not long after operations in the field have begun, and when everybody is athirst for glorious news, we hear of terrible shortcomings in our military machinery. Want of supplies, want of transport, want of organization, or want of men is crippling the army. Thereupon our policy is to make known to the world these gratifying facts; to work ourselves into a transport of indignation; to resolve the whole nation into a Committee to inquire into the matter; to gather damning evidence from every possible quarter; to abuse all the departments of war; and, finally, to send away a few unfortunate officials into the wilderness laden with the sins of the people. For to the people themselves and their representatives the misfortunes they bewail are certainly owing. In the face of a patriotic Opposition (and Oppositions always are patriotic) ready to make capital out of any attempt to entail fresh expense on the country, no Government would venture to propose a reform which would involve additional taxation. When by good luck we have somehow tided over the difficulty, a Commission is appointed to inquire into the facts, its Report is duly printed and discussed, and then we quietly let the matter drop, the disasters at which we once grew pale serving only to point a patriotic speech or to adorn a smart article.

In the case of our military administration we have however so far departed from our usual practice as, within ten years or so after one great war, and before entering on another, to obtain Reports, not only on the defects of the department which that war revealed, but also on the means of remedying them. Whether, after this unusually energetic effort, we shall remit the subject to limbo, or whether we shall proceed to act upon the recommendations of the Committee, it would be premature to say. Perhaps the most hopeful feature of the case is the alleged economy of the contemplated reform. "It may be estimated," says the Report, "that a sum is expended for superintending duties, with inadequate results, which might more than suffice to support a control department such as may be expected to promote unity of action, combined with economy in peace and efficiency in war, to an extent hitherto unknown in the administration of the service." An argument so potent would induce most Secretaries for War—occupied as they always are in paring every item of military expenditure down to the quick, so that the expenses of their department may conform, not to the requirements of the army, but to the exigencies of the Budget—to adopt a change without an over-nice calculation of its other merits. We may expect, therefore, to find that deliberation will in this instance be followed by action; and, in fact, an officer of known ability is said to have been already selected for the purpose of putting the new department, of which he will be the head, in working condition.

Anybody who reflects a little on the diverse nature of the supplies on which the soldier in the field is entirely dependent for his efficiency while in health, and for his relief in sickness, will be competent to understand the advantages that must flow from the combination, under one controlling power, of the various departments that minister to his needs. When we consider the jealousy of interference, the liability to error, the impracticability of temper, to which men in authority are so commonly subject, it is easy to understand how the independence of each department of supply will certainly, in all difficulties such as must arise in war, come to signify privation for the sound soldier and death to the sick. To bring the authority of the Commander-in-Chief, or of the Chief of the Staff, to bear upon all the differences that may arise between contending functionaries is to distract the attention of those officers from their special business of directing the operations of the army. Now and then a general is found of such exceptional energy that he can direct his influence into the minutest as well as the most important channels; yet even Wellington was forced to confess how serious were the embarrassments entailed upon him by the want of an efficient Intendance, and how greatly his difficulties were increased by the necessity of himself superintending the finance and supply of his army. On a smaller scale this matter was practically illustrated during the sitting of the present Committee, by its President, Lord Strathnairn, who wrote thus, in March last, from his command in Ireland:—

The action of the military departments under me, suddenly caused by the recent Fenian insurrectionary movement in this country, made me sensible of the want of a superior administrative officer near me, and always at hand, to act as Controller, so as to ensure a prompt execution of my orders, and an efficient and united working of the various departments. . . . Under the influence of the bad effects of the disunited working of these departments in an emergency, of the inconvenience and loss of time caused by my having to issue separate instructions to different departments here, without calling to mind the opinion to which the Committee had come on this very subject, I telegraphed to the War Office for a Controller, a striking illustration of the necessity of such a functionary.

The amalgamation of the departments of supply, the expediency of which was thus practically illustrated, had long been under the consideration of the War Office, and in 1865 the Secretary for War communicated to the Treasury an outline of the plan which forms the subject of this Report. The Committee were not, however, left with only the suggestions of others, or the ideas that had occurred to themselves in the course of their military experience, to assist them in devising a scheme. The two armies which stand at



present in the first rank, the French and the Prussian, already possess a complete and elaborate organization in the departments of supply and transport. The French Intendant-General, a functionary of great experience, and who is expected to possess an extensive range of qualifications, is always near the General-in-Chief, with whom he acts in concert, and whom he relieves of those cares and distractions which Wellington found so embarrassing, and which would entirely overwhelm a general of inferior industry and energy. This high officer is consulted on the plan of campaign; he is expected to furnish, whenever called on, a complete report of the resources in supply and transport, and the nature of the roads and vehicles, in any possible theatre of war. To every separate corps and division of the army, and to every important detachment, his subordinates are attached, aiding the generals in command of those bodies by combining the efforts of the different administrative departments, drawing from the surrounding district the necessary resources, arranging for the formation of depots and hospitals, and preparing to direct the streams of supply in accordance with the intended movement of the troops. Relieved thus of a vast amount of anxiety, calculation, and correspondence, the combatant chiefs are free to perform their proper strategical and tactical functions, and to devise operations without being perpetually hampered by preparing the means of carrying them into execution. With such examples to guide them, the Committee entered upon the consideration of their instructions, and framed their plan on the basis of forming the administrative service of the army by a combination of departments, consisting of one superintending and of several executive branches. Accepting some of these latter as they at present exist, and altering others, it is proposed to combine them under a "Department of Control"; and one way in which additional expense will be obviated will be to substitute officers of this department for those who now fill the highest posts in the executive branches. The special function of the new department is defined to be the direction and control of all supply-services in the field and in garrison, with direct responsibility to the Secretary of State for War, and through its officers locally, to the general or other officer commanding, for the completeness and efficiency of such services. At the head of it is to be an officer with the title of Chief-Controller, who will direct the department under the authority of the Secretary for War; and his subordinates will be the agents of the generals commanding in garrison or in the field in all that concerns supply, and in executing all orders connected with transport, provisions, pay, camp equipage, hospitals, and clothing. The Controller will, therefore, be always ready to supply the General with full information regarding the resources which may be relied on for the execution of a projected operation. Through the agency of treasurers he will keep all branches of the service supplied with the necessary funds. In concert with the Quartermaster-General's department, and in accordance with the projected strategical movements, he will provide the necessary quantity and description of transport, and will apportion it to the various branches to which it ministers, being held responsible not only for the efficiency of the regular train, but also for the organization of the hired transport of the theatre of war with which it may be necessary to supplement the military element. He is to arrange for the collection, custody, preparation, and distribution of food for man and beast, to make contracts for supplies, and to prepare estimates. Though not himself an accountant or custodian of public money, he will be responsible that all payments, and all issues of money and stores, are duly authorized by Parliamentary estimate, by regulation, or by local authority of the General. Thus, the Report goes on to say, "both Minister for War and general officers will be able to entrust greater powers, and give more confidence, to an officer in the position of Controller than they can, under the present system, to the several heads of departments, each naturally anxious to secure the utmost advantage and influence for his own department." In this way, then, the new department will receive and combine harmoniously the instructions of the two important officials, the General-in-Chief in the field and the Minister for War at home, and will thereupon proceed to direct for a common end those subordinate departments whose discords have so often marred the plans of statesmen and commanders. It is evident that the members of a department so important, and entailing duties so diverse and arduous, must be men of more than common ability and acquirement. They must possess a considerable knowledge of war, at least in theory, together with administrative talents of a high order. In time of peace they will be attached to large garrisons abroad, and to camps and military districts at home, where their duties are to be as much as possible assimilated to those which they will be called on to discharge in the field. The expansion of the department in war will be provided for by the temporary employment of military officers, of whom, ultimately, it will entirely consist. When the vast requirements of modern armies are considered, the comparative rapidity and decisiveness of their operations, and the completeness of administrative organization existing in the systems of those great Powers who may be our enemies or our allies in the next European war, it is easy to recognise the vast importance of aiding the generals commanding our troops in the field with a military administration so complete, so ready to give effect to an already matured system, and the members of which will be formed to habits of subordination and of command.

If there is any one of the executive branches that can be considered more important than another where all are indispensable, it is that of transport, on which all the rest are dependent. The

experience of the Crimea showed that it is of little avail to have great depots of stores collected on the theatre of war without the means of distributing them to the various divisions of the army; and if this was true of a campaign where the troops were stationary, far more would it apply to the more common case of an army moving rapidly towards distant and uncertain points. This, unfortunately, is precisely the point in which the scheme of the Committee, whose deliberations no doubt were fettered by the imperious necessity of the strictest economy, is weakest. Among its instructions it was required "to report to what extent an army transport in England, fit for expansion for service in war, could, by being used for transport purposes at home, pay, or in part pay itself." This recommendation appears to have carried with it at least as much weight as was intended, for the Committee expressly state that the amount of Military Train contemplated in their plan would, in case of an army taking the field, form but a very small proportion of the transport required, the bulk of which must be drawn from the resources of the seat of war and the neighbouring countries. Accepting this as a necessity of the case, they provide only for such a peace establishment as will perform remunerative labour, and which can in time of war be expanded to the extent of furnishing 3,600 men and 4,800 horses. Notwithstanding the assistance to be expected from railways, this proportion is so small compared with the necessities of any force worthy of being called an army, that we must expect great impediments to arise in our first operations in a foreign field, from the necessity of organizing and directing the heterogeneous mass of vehicles, and of undisciplined, perhaps reluctant, drivers, which the district may be found to supply.

In deciding to place all supplies as much as possible under the Department of Control, the Committee make one important exception. The reserves of ammunition, of artillery, and of projectiles are to be placed under the control of the commanding officer of artillery. The expediency of this step has long formed matter of dispute. On the one side it is argued by several authorities, especially by Captain Gordon, the Chief Superintendent of stores in Woolwich Arsenal, whose energy and ability were conspicuous in the same department in the Crimea, that this step would derange the whole organization, and that no part of the transport should be special; while, as he tells us, the custody and distribution of the stores in question are at present in the hands of sufficiently qualified officials. The Committee, however, supported by the opinion of officers of authority on the subject, have decided that further special and scientific qualifications are demanded for service in this particular branch, and that it requires an organization of such a character as will exclude it from the province of the Controller. The Ordnance Department will therefore be a distinct branch, in close connexion with the Royal Artillery, in great measure supplied with officials from that corps, and placed under the Director of Ordnance; but without a more distinct definition of the duties of this Department, and of the degree of independence it will assume, than the Report affords, it would be difficult to pronounce an opinion on this part of the scheme. With the exception of the suppression of the present Barrack Department, the duties of which will be distributed among the various branches under the Department of Control, we have now noticed the principal features of the new plan. We need not say that the reform, so far as it goes, is altogether in a right direction, and we can only hope that economical considerations may not be permitted to mar its perfect efficiency. But there is one circumstance in the Report which is rather ominous. The Committee "ventures to recommend that, as the duties of the officers of the proposed Control Department will be so much more highly onerous and important, as compared with those of the former officers, so their rates of pay should be increased in like proportion," from which proposal a member of the Committee, appointed subsequently to the others by the War Office, apparently in the interests of economy, deliberately and alone records his dissent. Still, as this scheme, unlike the proposed changes in the organization of the army itself, is not mere patchwork, but a thorough reform on a sound basis, any defects of detail which it may originally present will admit of easy remedy hereafter. The Report must be accepted merely as the outline of a plan which will require many additions to render it complete, or even thoroughly intelligible, as the discussion of some of its doubtful features, in the discussion in the House on Thursday night, sufficiently indicates.

#### MR. HALLÉ'S RECITALS.

MR. HALLÉ'S Pianoforte Recitals, which are annually resumed about this period, may, though on a smaller scale and addressed to a more limited and less musical audience, be looked at as in some sense supplementary to the Monday Popular Concerts. They have a similar object in view, and this object is followed out with the same uncompromising strictness. Instituted in 1861, under the title of "Beethoven Recitals," the programmes were at first exclusively devoted to Beethoven's sonatas for pianoforte alone, the whole of which, from Op. 2 to Op. 111, were included in a series of eight Recitals. In 1861 even the two jejune sonatas in G minor and major, Op. 49, were included; but in 1862, Mr. Hallé, considering these too trifling, substituted for them the 32 Variations on an Original Theme in C minor, and the *Andante* in F, originally intended for the sonata Op. 53, but afterwards rejected for a shorter and more appropriate movement.

This step, though undoubtedly foreign to his original design, met its reward in increased effectiveness. It was a responsible task to play the whole of Beethoven's sonatas, no one of which bears any resemblance to another—so many of them, too, as Mr. Hallé did, without book; and the manner in which it was accomplished met with warm and unanimous recognition. There are players endowed with a richer tone, more fluency, more vigour, a more naturally graceful manner of phrasing, and indeed more real enthusiasm than Mr. Hallé, but there are few that equal, fewer that surpass him, in lightness of touch and neatness of execution. His memory is prodigious, and it may safely be said that there is not a composition of importance, for clavier, harpsichord, or pianoforte, by any recognised master, from the Bachs and Handels to Weber and Mendelssohn, that he has not both in his head and at his fingers' ends. Though somewhat thin, his tone is bright and clear; though often dry, and occasionally affected, as when he strives to impart forced expression to a simple melody, thereby impeding its flow and destroying its symmetry, he is invariably earnest, painstaking, and correct. In short, Mr. Hallé is, in the truest acceptance of the term, an artist—not, like many a famous *virtuoso* that could be named, a man with a set number of classical pieces to order, but one to whom all that is worth knowing is familiar. When he announced his intention of playing the entire series of Beethoven's sonatas in the regular order of their publication, he announced nothing that he was not perfectly able to achieve. The great, and to ninety-nine pianists out of a hundred impracticable, sonata in B flat, Op. 106, fell as readily into its place as any of the others. His execution of this piece was marked from the outset by a composure and dexterity of manipulation that at once dispelled any doubt, if doubt had existed, as to the fact of his arriving at the end of the fugue, its extraordinary climax, just as safely as he had got to the end of the first part of the opening *allegro*. Anything more staid and orderly than his performance of the *adagio* and *finale* of this Leviathan of sonatas it would be difficult to imagine. But his sobriety was "classic." The pace at which he took the fugue—marked by Beethoven "*allegro risoluto—crotchet=144*"—was measured and careful, and he sustained it to the last with a quietude admirable to contemplate. Mr. Hallé has played the sonata "106," however, not merely once, but thrice—in 1861, 1862, and 1866. How many pianists can boast as much? In the salient characteristics of his style, Mr. Hallé is the very antipodes of his compatriot, Madame Schumann, and nowhere does their difference appear in so strong a light as in their reading of Beethoven's music. The one is frigid, deliberate, and always certain; the other is fiery, impulsive, and often incorrect. Nevertheless, both are great artists in their way, and should be taken *cum grano*.

The "Beethoven Recitals" obtained such a genuine success that they were repeated in 1862, and, allowing for the trifling modification to which reference has been made, precisely after the same manner. In 1863 a new plan was adopted. Mr. Hallé is too much of an eclectic, as what he has done in Manchester alone would suffice to prove, to stick year after year to a single author. Beethoven then was allowed to remain king of the feast, but no longer to sit solitary. Let Mr. Hallé speak for himself:—

The pre-eminence of Beethoven as an original and poetical composer for the pianoforte is indisputable; but, on the other hand, the claims of many other great musicians who have devoted their labour and genius at frequent intervals to the instrument, as well as of those, in another sense equally estimable, who, making it their exclusive study, have perhaps done more even than the admitted great masters to advance its mechanical progress, ought not to be overlooked.

This short extract from the preliminary announcement of the series of Recitals for 1863 is enough to explain the intended modification. A sonata by Beethoven was still a conspicuous feature of each Recital; but the rest of the programme was culled from other sources, with which Mr. Hallé showed himself just as intimately familiar. Bach, Handel, Scarlatti, Haydn, Mozart, Clementi, Dussek, John Field, Weber, Schubert, Mendelssohn, with others too numerous to mention, down even to Henselt, Chopin, and Heller, were drawn upon at various intervals, and an attractive series of eight performances was the result. In 1864 and 1865 this new scheme was followed out. In 1866 it was abandoned, Beethoven, during the eight Recitals, once more reigning supreme and alone. The return to the original plan, though it pleased many, did not quite satisfy the majority of those who go to hear Mr. Hallé "recite" on Friday afternoons in St. James's Hall. Eight years of Monday Popular Concerts, from twenty to thirty concerts a year, in the same building, had made a large number of Beethoven's sonatas familiar that used to be literally unknown except to musicians and the greediest of amateurs. The spell was therefore in a great measure dissipated, and a return in 1867 to the miscellaneous programme was regarded as certain. Expectation has not been disappointed. More than one innovation is observable in the arrangements for the present series. First, it is not deemed necessary that Beethoven, even with a single sonata or other *solo* piece, should figure in every programme. Then a new element is provided, in the violoncello, represented by Signer Piatti, its most distinguished professor, with the object of presenting a sonata for pianoforte and violoncello at each Recital, the five sonatas of Beethoven and the two left by Mendelssohn to be comprised in the series—which leaves just one chance for another composer. Lastly, "one of the principal" sonatas of Schubert for pianoforte alone is also to be introduced at each Recital. Schubert, however, composed ten pianoforte sonatas—three in A minor, two in D major, two in A major, one in E flat, and one in B flat—most of

them, if full proportions count, important. We shall be glad, at the same time, of eight out of the ten, and hope for the remaining two another season. Now and then, indeed, a Schubert sonata is enough to console one for the absence of a Beethoven; and the Schubert solo sonatas will be especially welcome this season, inasmuch as the violoncello sonatas of Beethoven, though unquestionably fine, are not among the finest productions of that wonderful genius—by no means to be compared, for example, with his sonatas for pianoforte and violin, which in their way are quite equal to his sonatas for pianoforte alone. Whatever may be said of Schubert by pedantic critics, one thing is certain—he was a heaven-born genius. He may not have been a great master, in the sense which we attach to the phrase when applied to men like Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. Though he could go on repeating ideas with enchanting reiteration, adding new ones (for his invention seemed inexhaustible) as suited his humour, he may possibly not have been a thorough master of development, and he perhaps too readily accepted the first ideas that presented themselves, jogging on from page to page in his own fluent and ingeniously discursive manner. All this and more may be admitted; but that Schubert was one of the greatest of melodists and one of the greatest of musical poets can only be questioned by those who are insensible to melody and poetry. Like everything else he has left us, his pianoforte sonatas are full of interest, engagingly melodious, bold in form, rich in grand harmonies, daring and nearly always happy in modulation, and thoroughly original—one sonata of Schubert being no more like another than one sonata of Beethoven is like another. Unhappily for Schubert, Beethoven was already famous when Schubert was born; and as they ran their careers together, the smaller man was lost in the brightness of the greater. But to be smaller than Beethoven may yet mean to be great; and the greatness of Schubert's genius, now that he has been forty years dead, is every day becoming more generally acknowledged. The introduction of the sonatas of this rare genius, indeed, is the most interesting feature in Mr. Hallé's present series of Recitals. He has already given four—the A minor, Op. 42, the D major, Op. 53, the *Fantasia-Sonata*, as it is called, although as regular in form as its companions, in G major, Op. 78 (the three of which Schumann speaks in raptures), and the smaller sonata in A major, without a *scherzo*, which, though marked by the publishers "Op. 120," bears every mark of being an early work.\* About each of these a separate article might be written; but we must be satisfied with adding that Mr. Hallé, who was never playing better than this year, plays Schubert quite as well as he plays Beethoven. No more need be said. We have also had Mozart's most graceful sonata in F (1779); Beethoven in D, the third of the famous Op. 10; Beethoven in G, the first of Op. 31 (not "Op. 29" as publishers strangely insist upon numbering it); and *Didone Abandonnata*, the grandest sonata of Clementi, one of the most genuine and original of Italian composers—besides preludes and fugues from the *Clavier wohl temperirte*, a selection from one of the *Suites Françaises* (the "little suites," as they are called, in deference to the larger and nobler *Suites Anglaises*), and the magnificent *Fantasia e Fuga Chromatica*, of John Sebastian Bach. Add to this some pretty specimens of Chopin and Stephen Heller, composers who evidently stand high in Mr. Hallé's favour, and it will readily be believed that his Recitals are now as varied in attraction as could be desired. He might be asked, by the way, whether Woelfl and Steibelt, of the Cramer-Clementi-Dussek period, and Ferdinand Hiller, among contemporary composers for the piano, are entered in his *index* prohibitory or expurgatory. Sterndale Bennett, too, has published some works which are at least equal to many that have been included in the Recitals; and though Sterndale Bennett is an Englishman, so was John Field. But it must not be forgotten that many of the best sonatas of Haydn, Mozart, Clementi, and Dussek still remain unheard; and that Mr. Hallé has his hands fully employed at present with Schubert, Schumann (*Noctettes*!), &c., in the way of *solos*. Nevertheless, the *Rondo Piacerele*, the *Allegro Grazioso*, or an occasional selection from the *Suite de Pièces* of Bennett would by no means be unwelcome.

The sonatas for pianoforte and violoncello already introduced have been the first four of Beethoven—in G minor and F major, Op. 5, A major, Op. 60, and C major, the first of the two dedicated to the Countess Erdödy, both of which essentially belong to the so-styled "third period." How these are played by Mr. Hallé and Signor Piatti is, thanks to the Monday Popular Concerts, sufficiently well known.

By a judicious modification in the charges of admission to certain parts of the hall, Mr. Hallé now affords a much wider class opportunities of deriving instruction as well as amusement—lessons, in short, for such they are to those desirous of learning by example—from his very interesting performances.

#### ASCOT RACES.

THE laudable wish of the French Emperor to establish an international race worthy the name has not been altogether successfully realized. The principal reason for the failure is the period chosen for the Parisian contest—namely, between Epsom and Ascot. After the first of these great meetings, and before the second, a little rest is absolutely necessary; and the races at Ascot are so im-

\* None of Schubert's sonatas were printed in his lifetime, and no care whatever seems to have been taken to ascertain the exact dates of their production.



portant, and the stakes so valuable, that few owners are disposed to allow their horses to encounter immediately before that meeting the risk of a long journey, including two sea-passages, which almost invariably produce some disagreeable effects. Hence, out of thirty-one horses entered for the French race by English owners, only one in the end appeared at the post, and that one was D'Estournel. Every possible method had been tried to induce him to race decently and in order, but without success. As a last resource, a sea-voyage was recommended, it being perhaps thought that what often suits disagreeable people may also be good for disagreeable horses. The prescription answered in this instance, and the wolf assumed sheep's clothing, for positively D'Estournel was admired as much for his quietness as for his good looks. Of the nine French horses, two, belonging to Count Lagrange, had been trained at Newmarket, and one, the eventual winner, and the property of M. de Montgomery, in Yorkshire. The race seemed as if it would be a match between D'Estournel and Patricien, the latter's claims being based on his victory in the French Derby, the former's on his thoroughly racing-like appearance and well-known powers of galloping. Fervacques, who was thought so little of in the North of England that his weight for the Northumberland Plate is only 5 st. 13 lbs., was fortunate in having Fordham as his rider; and to these three the race was confined. M. Delamarre's second horse, Honolulu, made the running for his stable companion as long as he could, and, when his powers were exhausted, Patricien took it up for himself. D'Estournel was his immediate attendant till near the close of the race, when Fervacques, who had gradually made up his ground, joined him. A furlong from home D'Estournel was beaten, and Patricien appeared to be winning easily; but Fordham brought up Fervacques with a tremendous rush, and the horse running with great gameness, a dead-heat was the result. The deciding heat was almost again an equal triumph for the pair, but the judge gave it to Fervacques by the shortest of heads.

We must no longer keep from Ascot, where the racing was so varied in interest and importance that our limits will scarcely enable us to do justice to it. The heath on the first day was in excellent order, and the fields were large. Fifteen appeared for the Trial Stakes, of whom only one, Ostreger, carried 9 lbs. extra for exemption from sale. The splendid son of Stockwell had thus to bear the impost of 10 st. 9 lbs., and to give very nearly 5 st. to the best of the two-year-olds engaged. This was too much for him, up that severe hill particularly; but still he came in a good third, and only about a length and a half from the winner. A very useful-looking colt belonging to Mr. Merry, by Dennee out of Ennui, secured the first place; and we were surprised that his owner should have been willing to part with him, as he was obliged to do, according to the conditions of the race. Twenty-two two-year-olds came to the post for the Maiden Plate, which last year was won by The Palmer. Great things were said this year of his brother Rosicrucian, the representative of the same stable, and he won with ease. Like his brother, he is a colt of high quality and of taking appearance; but he seemed to us, after the race, as if he were a high blower, and we hope that he will turn out nothing worse. There was a good deal of swerving in this race just as the flag fell, which must have jeopardized the chances of a good many. Contempt, for one, who finished a very respectable third, was quite shut out for the greater part of the race, and unable to get through her horses. The Prince of Wales's Stakes was the principal race of the day, perhaps of the week, and curiously enough the colours of the paddock ticket, as at Epsom, corresponded with the colours of the winner. The race was manifestly confined to Vauban, Achievement, and Marksman. All the interest was centred in the performances of these three, and though Owain Glyndwr, Star of India, Van Amburgh, Julius, Bavioli, Beanstalk, Seville, Thornapple, and Padishah started, few people took much notice of them or of their preliminary canter. Neither Achievement nor Vauban are beauties to look at, although they may be good ones to go. Marksman was the chief object of admiration, though it was currently reported that he had done very little work since Epsom. He looked well enough, however, but scarcely entered so well as on the Derby day. It being extensively believed that Vauban lost the Derby because there was nothing to make the running for him, Distin, who was to have fulfilled that office, failing in its accomplishment, Seville was brought out on this occasion as *avant-courier*. Right well she took the lead, and right well she kept up a tremendous pace till eight out of the twelve were beaten. Directly she retired, Vauban took her place side by side with Achievement, Marksman being third. There were only these three left in the straight. Marksman would not gallop when he was wanted. Achievement, who had beaten everything for speed, could not stay when she was wanted; so Vauban was left to himself and won in the most common canter, Achievement beating Marksman and everything else just as easily. It is evident from this running, as well as from his comparative performances in the Craven and First Spring Meetings at Newmarket, that Vauban cannot make the running for himself, but that if the running is made—and the faster the better—he will be quite ready to come in at the finish, when running is done with, and staying is needed. At the same time, if his defeat in the Derby may be partly ascribed to the badness of the pace, it must not be forgotten that it was also due to his inability to come down the hill, which was a serious disadvantage, and one that could not have been mended by any extraneous help. But that on a course suited to his conformation he is almost the best, if not the best, stayer of his year, there can be now no doubt. Achievement lived the pace,

and enjoyed it; but the hill stopped her, and she died away to nothing. She may run better on the flat at Doncaster, for her speed is still wonderful; but even on favourable ground we are sceptical as to her getting a long distance. Marksman did not run within pounds of his Derby form. There may be special causes—want of work, and the like; but want of heart is his worst complaint, and one for which we fear there is no cure. Ostreger was unnecessarily brought out again in the Queen's Stand Plate, for which several horses famous over a short course were entered. Cecrops, carrying 9 st. 12 lbs., accomplished a brilliant victory, and added fresh lustre to his great reputation. Xi was never formidable, but See-Saw made a good fight with the winner, who was giving her 3 st., and Mrs. Stratton was only half a length behind the pair. The Ascot Stakes, once the great race of the day, is now dwarfed into insignificance by the great three-year-old contest that precedes it. A very fair lot of handicap horses, to the number of seventeen, appeared in due course. Gomera carried the top weight, 8 st. 12 lbs., and Zenobia, 5 years, was only burdened with 7 st. 4 lbs. This mare has long been waiting for a chance of winning an important race, and her name will be unpleasantly familiar to many in connexion with last year's Cesarewitch. It was scarcely probable that she would ever get into a large handicap on more lenient terms than in the present instance, and so her forfeits, which amounted to the formidable sum of one thousand pounds, were paid off in the course of last week to qualify her for starting. Lord of the Dales, who is himself a good handicap horse, made the running for Gomera, but it appeared to us that Zenobia had the race at her mercy at any moment. She did not assume the lead, however, till shortly before the turn into the new course, but when once she went to the front she was never again headed. Gomera made a gallant fight under the heavy weight, and was a good second, and the colt by Vedette out of Vixen, who ran out at one of the turns and lost a good deal of ground, was third. In the next race for two-year-olds Suffolk was opposed by Vale Royal, a good-looking colt of Lord Stamford's, who will assuredly race one day, two of Lord Hastings's, See-Saw and The Earl, and three others. Suffolk ought to have had no difficulty in beating this lot, but, truth to say, he did not win with consummate ease. Indeed he galloped stiffly, and looked decidedly stale, and this impression was confirmed when we saw him walking in the paddock. He has done a good amount of work this year already, and evidently would be the better now for some seasonable rest. The Gold Vase was won by Mail Train, of all horses in the world, who for six years has tried in vain to get his head in first, and whose very name had become a standing joke, from his always being entered in big races and invariably being beaten. Moulsey, furthermore, was one of his opponents, but he carried his full weight of 9 st. 3 lbs., while Mail Train received allowances that reduced his burden to 7 st. 13 lbs. Regalia, Grand Cross, Knight of the Garter, Tourmalin, Roquefort, and two more, made up the field. Moulsey cantered as exuberantly as ever before the race, and it seemed scarcely possible that he could be beaten; but either long continuous work has told its tale, or he was not in the humour, for he was never formidable. It was a match between Mail Train and Regalia, who ran in wonderfully improved form, from the beginning of the enclosure, but, though the mare struggled very gamely, she could never quite reach her more lightly-weighted opponent, who thus won his maiden race by a neck in most excellent company. As if the overthrow of Moulsey was not startling enough for one day, the succeeding event resulted in the defeat of the unfortunate Savernake, who appeared quite unable to stay up the hill, and was beaten by both Dalesman and Westwick.

The quiet of Wednesday was most agreeable after the bustle of the preceding day. Hermit was opposed by Julius, Dragon, Wroughton, Huntsman, and Tynedale, for the Ninth Biennial. The Derby winner looked much improved, even in the short time that has elapsed since his great victory. He has lost that mean and jaded look which was the only thing noticed about him in the Derby paddock, and his appearance was more in harmony with his high qualities. Julius also looked well, but Wroughton and Dragon were like a couple of coach-horses. Hermit beat Julius as easily as Julius beat all the rest. Wroughton, as at Bath, ran as fast as he could, but collapsed utterly at the hill. How he came to run Vauban to a head at Newmarket would be a mystery, if we had not learned by experience that Vauban cannot show his best unless there is something to make running for him. A dark colt, of whom rumour had spread wonderful reports, named Michael de Basco, made his debut in the Fifteenth Triennial. He is a fine-topped horse, though rather weak behind the saddle, but very leggy. He made a very poor exhibition, however; as also did Restitution, of whom we expected better things from his running at Epsom. Vale Royal also ran much more indifferently than on the preceding day; and the race was left to Europa, Uncas, and Formosa, who ran wide of the rest on the Stand side of the course, and were scarcely observed at first. Fordham brought up Europa well at the finish, and won by three-quarters of a length from Uncas. The Danebury stable seems to have a monopoly of the good fillies this year with Athena, Lady Elizabeth, and Europa, their only worthy rival at present being Leonie, who did not appear at this meeting. Thirty ran for the Royal Hunt Cup, which is a remarkably pretty sight, but nothing very great in the way of racing. There were plenty of horses in at favourable weights, notably Camellia, 5 years, 6 st. 3 lbs., Mayonaise filly, 4 years, 5 st. 9 lbs., and Union

Jack, 6 years, 7st. 4 lbs. No handicapping favours, however, can make thoroughly worthless animals win, and Camellia was beaten before half the distance was accomplished. Gardeisure, 5 years, 7st. 8 lbs., looked remarkably well and cantered well, but she refused to try a yard in the race. Actaea, 4 years, 7st. 4 lbs., has lost all form at present, and Dalesman, 4 years, 7st. 8 lbs., is not suited to this sort of race. There was fortunately but little delay at the start, and Baron Rothschild's other horse, Jasper, got the lead and retained it throughout to the end. Wild Agnes, 5 years, 8st. 12 lbs., ran remarkably well under the weight, and finished third. The winner has never performed successfully before, though he was highly thought of at one time for the City and Suburban. The Fernhill Stakes was a match between Blue Gown and Grimston, and the former, getting a great advantage in the start (on which everything depends in these half-mile races) won by three-quarters of a length, though Grimston made up a good deal of lost ground in the running. The succeeding race was also carried off by Sir Joseph Hawley with The Palmer, though he was hard pushed by Montgoubert and The Priest. Wells rode very finely, and The Palmer certainly showed considerable gameness, for he appeared to be beaten opposite the Stand, but came again and won by a head from the French horse. The Coronation Stakes was a mere canter for Achievement, who, over her own distance, a mile, will still hold her own against all antagonists. On Thursday the racing was not very interesting, and the crowd being extremely dense, not very enjoyable. Lord Lyon had to concede 2 st. to Wild Moor, who was fourth in the Derby, and 2 st. 10 lbs. to Harpenden, over the Old Mile, and many who are persistently sceptical about his real merits doubted his ability to give away the weight. Carrying his 10 st., however, as if it were a feather, he cantered in with the most ridiculous ease. We never saw him looking better. His condition was perfect, and his muscular development extraordinary. At the same time he is not a horse to run twice in one day, or twice in one week even, however easily the first victory may be accomplished; but when he comes out fresh and well, and runs over his favourite distance, weight is a matter of indifference to him. Only a moderate lot went for the Fifth New Biennial, and Tregeagle, getting a good start, beat See-Saw and Bismark (who might have been second) cleverly. The Cup came next, and the ten competitors paraded, according to custom, in the Royal Enclosure. Last year, it will be remembered, there were only three starters; and though ten went this year, some of them must have been started more for the honour of the thing than for any chance that they possessed of winning. Such were Lord Glasgow's representative, Tormentor—a wonderfully moderate mare for an Oaks winner—Julius, Opoponax, and Montgoubert. Of the rest, Regalia looked remarkably well and fit, despite her severe run for the Gold Vase on Tuesday, and her less arduous exertions in the Hunt Cup on Wednesday. Lecturer looked wonderfully improved from the rest so properly given to him since Bath, and more in the condition in which he appeared at Northampton. He ran for the first time in plates. Rama attracted less admiration than the two above-named, but no fault could be found with Hippias. There was, of course, no difficulty in despatching them from the starting-post, and John Davis at once proceeded to make the running as hard as he could, which he appeared to us to accomplish more effectually than at Northampton. Lord Glasgow's colt was soon beaten off, but the rest kept very good company till about three-quarters of a mile from home, when John Davis gave way. Soon afterwards Rama disappeared, and Regalia and Hippias came on together, attended by Lecturer. Hippias tried to come at the half-distance, but almost immediately succumbed; and Regalia, going well within herself, appeared to have the race at her mercy. Fordham did not bring up Lecturer till just opposite the Royal Stand, and either Regalia's jockey made too sure of the race and left off riding, or the mare was exhausted, for she stopped dead in the last few strides, and Lecturer rushed past and won by nearly two lengths. It was a brilliant performance, both of the horse and the jockey; for nine riders out of ten would have come much earlier, and very probably would have thereby lost. It was a fine performance also of Regalia, after the severe work she has done lately; nor was Hippias disgraced, although defeated. Lady Elizabeth positively walked away with the New Stakes, reminding us of a similar performance by the unfortunate Liddington three years ago, and Hermit disposed in like manner of The Palmer and Wild Moor in the St. James's Palace Stakes.

We must not omit to mention that the general arrangements of the meeting, the accommodation and accessibility of the paddocks, enclosures, and stands, the excellence of the provisions supplied, and the promptitude of the attendance, contrast very favourably with the wretched dirt, disorder, and discomfort of Epsom.

## REVIEWS.

### THE OXFORD REFORMERS OF 1498.\*

THE title of a book is not a matter of much consequence, but there is no reason why it should suggest a wrong idea of the book. Mr. Seebohm calls his book "The Oxford Reformers of 1498." It is a very definite title, and raises expectations in the

\* *The Oxford Reformers of 1498: being a History of the Fellow-work of John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More.* By Frederic Seebohm. London: Longmans & Co. 1867.

reader's mind of a reform connected specially with Oxford, and with the date 1498. We naturally look for a history of some University reform at that time; or, if not that, at least of some reforming school or movement belonging to Oxford more than to any other place. But the book is really, as it is described in an alternative title, an account of the "Fellow-work of John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More." Now certainly Colet was reading lectures at Oxford in 1498; and Erasmus and More were at Oxford about that time; and all three were friends, and were of reforming tendencies. But it seems to us rather fanciful to call them, for that reason, the "Oxford Reformers of 1498." Their reforming ideas did not belong particularly to Oxford or to 1498, nor was Oxford the sphere where their work developed itself and produced its effect. It would be intelligible and natural to speak of Parsons and Copleston, or of Keble and Newman, or of the Royal Commissioners of 1852, or of the gentlemen who have lately published "Essays" and "Questions" on Parliamentary Reform, as "Oxford Reformers" of their respective dates. They were reformers either of Oxford or in Oxford, identified with the place, and deriving a considerable part of the peculiar interest attaching to them from their connexion with Oxford. But because Mr. Gladstone and Sir R. Palmer are Reformers, and because they studied and formed their ideas in Oxford and were doubtless largely influenced by the place, and because Mr. Gladstone made a speech about Reform at the Union, and perhaps Sir R. Palmer too, it would be rather a forced way of describing them, when their biographies are written in the year 2000, to speak of them as the "Oxford Reformers of 1832."

And this is not merely a matter of title-page. It indicates an imperfect conception and weakness of plan in the work itself. It shows a want of eye in the writer for historical perspective and proportion, and a disposition to make interest by arbitrary assumptions and suppositions where the interest which he wants does not come to his hand. Dean Colet, though not a personage of the first rank, yet made a considerable figure in his day, and Mr. Seebohm has studied him with sympathy and care. Erasmus, and no doubt More, valued and honoured him. But it is a mistake to make a secondary character the centre of a group, and to represent much greater ones revolving round it. At any rate, if this is done, it ought to be justified. It ought to be shown that the supposed secondary mind really had a much greater share in what was thought and done by the more prominent ones than has been commonly believed. But we do not see that Mr. Seebohm has made out that Erasmus and More owed to Colet what people have hitherto given them credit for as their own. The truth is, Mr. Seebohm's plan is an artifice to secure attention for a subject about which by itself there was hardly enough to say. He rightly feels that Dean Colet was a considerable man and occupied an important place in his day; that he was so appears by the language of his friends; but the chief events of his life are soon told, and there is not much more to be found out about him. So a kind of fictitious interest and magnitude is created for him—fictitious, we mean, only as regards the want of producible memorials, by making him one, and the senior at least, if not the chief, of a trio of whom the other two are Erasmus and Sir Thomas More. There is a want of skill in thus laying out a book, and arranging extracts, in themselves of much interest, illustrating the early tendencies of the Reformation, from the writings of these great men, of whom it is hard to say whether they were more its friends or its antagonists.

Having made these reserves as to the plan of the book, reserves which materially affect a reader's satisfaction when he makes acquaintance with a new and promising work, and having added that there are occasional marks of want of exactness and of familiarity with English ways of writing, we may say that it is the book of a real student, and throws light on a very interesting transition period—namely, the score or so of years after Savanarola and before Luther, when the idea of the Reformation as it was to be did not yet exist, and when men were laying down large and loose principles of change in a state of things which had become monstrous and intolerable, without in the least seeing where their principles would carry them. The author commences by taking us to Oxford in 1496, where Colet was beginning to lecture. The opening paragraph is a specimen of Mr. Seebohm's way of putting his subject before us, and of what to us seems a mistaken way:—

It was probably in Michaelmas Term of 1496 that the doctors and students of the University of Oxford were startled by the announcement that a late student, recently returned from Italy, was about to deliver a course of public and gratuitous lectures in exposition of St. Paul's Epistles.

And he goes on to talk of its being an "event of no small significance and novelty in the closing years of that last of the middle ages," especially as the "would-be lecturer had not yet entered deacon's orders," or "obtained, or tried to obtain, a doctor's degree." He conjectures that such boldness must have ruffled the authorities, who had "put their necks to the collar," and "ground on patiently in the scholastic treadmill," and who may be supposed to have asked with surprise and uneasiness whether,

if the exposition of the Scriptures was to be admitted at Oxford, it ought not, at least, to be restricted to those duly authorized to discharge it? and whether any stripling who might travel as far as to Italy, and return infected with the "new learning," was to be allowed to set himself up as a theological teacher without graduating in divinity, and without waiting, for decency's sake, for the Bishop's ordination.

The obvious question is, why did not these uneasy authorities, as they had ample power to do, stop him? But the whole con-



ception of the circumstance is a mere piece of exaggeration for the sake of rhetorical effect. The notion of confining lectures, such as Colet's, to men in orders, or even to men with a degree, was foreign to the period. And Mr. Seebohm only quotes as his proof a bit of an invective of Tyndale's, which is neither more nor less than what a Puritanical despiser of human philosophy might have said of Oxford or Cambridge in the middle of the nineteenth century. If Mr. Seebohm could have given us some authentic illustrations of the real University practice existing at the time, he would have done something useful and instructive. But to these lectures of Colet Mr. Seebohm ascribes important results. They were, he thinks, not merely the beginning, or the revival, of true biblical study in Oxford; they were not only a bold protest both against the scholasticism of Thomists and Scotists, and against that more plausible but equally narrow Augustinianism which in the end captivated Luther and Calvin, and gave a fatally wrong turn to the theology of the Reformation; they not only set an example of a larger and more liberal way of looking on the meaning and language of Christianity and its documents; but they were the stimulus, together with Colet's society and conversation, which awakened the minds of Erasmus and Thomas More, and the determining influence which fixed the bent of their principles and the direction of their studies. That Colet lectured, that he disliked the schoolmen, and that he formed a warm friendship with Erasmus, and made the acquaintance of More, who at that time was but a student, are the materials out of which Mr. Seebohm constructs a very precise and detailed picture. But it is a picture which depends a good deal on what his own imagination furnishes. And his imagination seems to us sometimes to outrun his evidence. It rests mainly on rather unsafe foundations—the rhetorical compliments and praises contained in the letters of Erasmus. It hardly follows, if he speaks of Colet's lectures being attended by students and doctors, and even if *allatis codicibus* means "bringing," not as we should have thought, "their books," but as Mr. Seebohm renders it, "their note-books," that the lectures were of all the importance assigned them. Every crowded lecture is not one which changes the course of things. And from the specimens which Mr. Seebohm gives us of them, we should think that it is making too much of them to speak of them as proofs of "Colet's method of free critical interpretation," and of the "scientific spirit and inductive method of the new learning." Doubtless they show the reaction against the stiff dialectic theology of the schools; but they show the rawness and shallowness, as well as the injustice, which accompany the first efforts of a reaction. The contempt and hatred which Colet expressed for Aquinas, and his extolling of simplicity in theology, which Mr. Seebohm holds up to admiration, were exceedingly natural and pardonable after what scholastic theology had come to under the sanction of the Papal régime; but perhaps, though people might be accused of getting tired of Aquinas, and still more of the use which had been made of him, he understood the real problems and difficulties of theology as well as his irritated and impatient critics. Colet's sentiment, which Mr. Seebohm quotes continually—"Keep to the Bible and the Apostles' Creed, and let divines, if they like, dispute about the rest"—is no doubt a fine one; but unluckily it is finer in sound than in working; for not merely divines, but men, will ask questions "about the rest," and it is difficult to find in "the rest" deeper and harder problems than arise of themselves out of the Bible and the Apostles' Creed. Mr. Seebohm, at this time of day, should have seen that, though every allowance is due in 1498 for a sensible and ardent man like Colet abusing Aquinas, the echo of his abuse, after all that has been done for the history of philosophy, is simply analogous to the vulgar abuse of Aristotle which was once fashionable in days when no one knew what he was, and his name had been made a pretext for intellectual tyranny and indolence. Nor in the fact that Erasmus corresponded with Colet and valued his friendship and good opinion, can we see any proof of the special pre-eminence which Mr. Seebohm is disposed to assign to Colet's influence over the mind and activity of his more illustrious contemporary. "Erasmus," he says, "owed everything to him." This is the way in which people exaggerate; a fact cannot be stated without being ridiculously overstated. So, of More, he says that More's faith in science had been probably "caught from Colet," for that "Colet had been the first of the little group of Oxford Reformers to proclaim that Christianity had nothing to fear from the new learning." More's *Utopia* and Erasmus's New Testament are really due to Colet's influence:—

Still more remarkable is it that two such works, written by two such men, should be traceable to the influence and express the views of a more obscure but greater man than they. Yet, in truth, half the merit of both these works belongs fairly to Colet. As the *Novum Instrumentum*, upon careful examination, proves to be the expression, on the part of Erasmus, not merely of his own isolated views, but of the views held in common by the little band of Oxford Reformers on the great subject on which it treats, so the *Utopia* will be found, in great measure, the expression, on More's part, of the views of the same little band of friends on social and political questions. On most of these questions Erasmus and More, in the main, thought alike; and they owed their common conviction chiefly to the influence of Colet.

Erasmus and More lived in the atmosphere of their day, and knew what people were thinking as well as most men; and, with all respect to Colet, we cannot but believe that they were as able as Colet to form their own conclusions for themselves. After Mr. Seebohm's rather grand way of treating the presence together of the three "Oxford Reformers" in the University in 1498, the concluding paragraph of his chapter reads rather like a lame anticlimax:—

Thus, in the spring of 1499, the happy intercourse of the three friends at Oxford came to an end—one might be tempted almost to say, to an untimely end. For had Erasmus stayed at Oxford but another year or two, Colet might perhaps have made him fully his own, and then what conquests might not Colet and he have achieved together. Young More, too, must in that case surely have thrown in his lot with them; the natural bent of his mind, strengthened by a few months more of Colet's silent influence, must surely have overcome his father's strong utilitarian prejudices. He, too, might thus have become a fellow-worker with Colet and Erasmus at Oxford, instead of a lawyer at Lincoln's Inn. But, however Colet might have longed that it might be so, it was not so to be.

Was, then, the influence of Colet, exerted with so delicate and wise a tact during this year of college life, all thrown away?

Colet was soon after made Dean of St. Paul's, and showed his large views and his good sense in the foundation of a good working school and in the regulations which he framed for it. Mr. Seebohm shows fairly enough the improbability of the supposition, adopted by Knight and Jortin, that an account by Erasmus of the cruelties of schoolmasters was meant for Colet's school. He was a brave man, and preached about the evils of war when Henry VIII. was preparing for his French campaign, and against the worldliness and vices of the clergy in a Convocation met for the extirpation of heresy. He was of course looked upon with suspicion and dislike by a large party; but he was protected by Warham, and the King was still in his better days, and treated him with favour. His enemy was Fitzjames the Bishop of London; Mr. Seebohm surmises that he was meant in an anecdote given by Erasmus as an illustration of the verse in St. Paul's Epistle to Titus (iii. 10) upon rejecting a heretic:—

Whether Bishop Fitzjames succeeded equally well in securing the inhuman object which was nearest to his heart, is not equally clear. But one authentic picture of a scene which there can be little doubt occurred in this Convocation has been preserved, to give a passing glimpse into the nature of the discussion which followed on the subject of the "extirpation of heresy." In the course of the debates, the advocates of increased severity against the poor Lollards were asked to point out, if they could, a single passage in the Canonical Scriptures which commands the capital punishment of heretics. Whereupon an old divine (was it Bishop Fitzjames?) rose from his seat, and with some severity and temper quoted the command of St. Paul to Titus, "a man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." The old man quoted the words as they stand in the Vulgate version, "*Hæreticum hominem post unam et alteram correptionem devota*!" "*De Vita*!" he repeated with emphasis; and again, louder still, he thundered, "*De-VITA!*" At length he proceeded to explain that the meaning of the Latin verb, "*devotare*," being "*de vita tollere*," the passage in question was clearly a command to punish heretics by death.

There is not much more to be said of Colet than that Erasmus wrote occasional letters to him, sent him books, and received his observations; and that he died regretted by Erasmus and More. The volume proceeds with sketchy accounts of the fortunes of the two latter up to the time of Colet's death. The most interesting part of it seems to us to be the copious extracts which Mr. Seebohm makes from their writings. A passage from the *Institutio Principis Christiani* of Erasmus, on taxation, is a remarkable bit of sound financial teaching for the days of Henry VIII. and Charles V.:—

Erasmus then proceeded to enquire what mode of taxation would prove least burdensome to the people. And the conclusion he came to was, that "a good prince will burden with as few taxes as possible such things as are in common use among the lowest classes, such things as corn, bread, beer, wine, clothes, and other things necessary to life. Whereas these are what are most burdened, and in more than one way; first, by heavy taxes, which are farmed out and commonly called *assizes*; then by *customs*, which again are farmed out in the same way; lastly, by *monopolies*, from which little revenue comes to the prince, while the poor are maled with good charges. Therefore it would be best, as I said, that the prince should increase his revenue by contracting his expenditure; and if he cannot avoid taxing something, and the affairs of the people require it, let those foreign products be taxed which minister not so much to the necessities of life, as to *luxury and pleasure*, and which are only used by the rich; as, for instance, fine linen, silk, purple, pepper, spices, ointments, gems, and whatever else is of that kind.

Erasmus is always interesting even when we feel suspicious of his perfect sincerity; lively and quicksighted, full of strong good sense and humour, if not, as indeed he seldom is, exhaustive and deep, either in thought or feeling. Of still greater interest are the extracts from a book which few modern readers know except by name, More's *Utopia*. The satire on the corrupt morality and selfishness of the political maxims and arrangements of his age is bold and original; but still more curious are his anticipations of modern changes of thought; his ideas on education, on labour, on toleration, and on joint public worship by persons of differing creeds:—

Temples, nobly built and spacious, in whose solemn twilight men of all sects meet, in spite of their distinctions, to unite in a public worship, avowedly so arranged that nothing may be seen or heard which shall jar with the feelings of any class of the worshippers—nothing in which all cannot unite (for every sect performs its own peculiar rites in private); no images . . . no forms of prayer but such as any one may use without prejudice to his own private opinion . . . incense and other sweet odours and waxen lights, burned not from any notion that they can confer any benefit on God, which men's prayers cannot, but because they are useful aids to the worshippers; the men on one side of the temple, the women on the other, all clothed in white; the whole people rising as the priest who conducts the service enters the temple in his beautiful vestment, wonderfully wrought of birds' plumage, accompanied by music; then priests and people uniting in solemn prayer to God in a set form of words, so composed that each can apply its meaning to himself, offering thanks for the benefits which surround them, for the happiness of their commonwealth, for their having embraced a religious persuasion, which they *hope* is the true one; praying that, if they are mistaken, they may be led to that which is *really* the true one, so that all may be brought to unity of faith and practice, unless in his inscrutable will the Almighty should otherwise ordain; and concluding with a prayer, that as soon as it may please him, he may take

them to himself; lastly, this prayer concluded, the whole congregation bowing solemnly to the ground, and then, after a short pause, separating to spend the remainder of the day in innocent amusement—this was More's ideal of public worship.

The idea of elaborate ritualism joined with a broad creed can hardly be said to be familiar yet in our age; but it seems much odder in 1515. What Mr. Seebohm does not help us to understand is how far this was grave joking, what More thought of his own performance, and what he meant by it. And he seems to us to fail in making out More a philosophical utilitarian before his time. As a history of the men, or even, as Mr. Seebohm calls it, of the "joint-work"—though a good deal of gossip, with a due amount of moralizing on it, is collected together—we cannot call it very satisfactory. Mr. Seebohm has a theory, and, fairly enough, he writes to support it; he contrasts Colet, Erasmus, and More, as the leaders of a larger and more sensible school of Christian teaching, both with the Roman theologians and with Luther, who fell into the contradictions and narrowness of "Augustinianism." He looks upon his "Oxford Reformers" as anticipating the ideas and method of the broad and liberal school of our own day; he likes to put their supposed views in modern terms and formulæ; and he laments that what promised so hopefully was interrupted or suspended for three centuries by the theology of the Protestant Reformation, "as hard, exclusive, and artificial as that of Rome which it displaced." It seems to us an utterly untenable theory. In the first place, Mr. Seebohm overlooks the fact that the greatest warmth, and human sympathy, and largeness of thought, are perfectly compatible with the stiffest dogmatism, whether Roman, like Bossuet's or Lacordaire's, or Protestant, as, to take a recent instance, Vinet's. It was not really dogmatism, or Augustinianism, or, for that matter, even Scholasticism, in which Dante had found poetry and devotion enough, that was in fault in the days of Erasmus; it was stupidity and corruption, and ignorance, and brute selfishness, which desired to be let alone and have its way. And in the next place, the theory seems to us historically a very forced one which is obliged to make of Sir Thomas More, because he was an enthusiast for improvement, good sense, and literature, a vowed opponent of dogmatic and Roman theology. If Mr. Seebohm thinks that he changed in after years, he ought to show it. If More was during Colet's lifetime, and when he wrote the *Utopia*, what he was when he went to the scaffold, it is very misleading to make him out a premature Broad Churchman, because he was an honest man and was severe on hypocritical monks and bigots. Mr. Seebohm thus states the general result of his view:—

It is obvious that at the foundation of the position here assumed by Erasmus, and elsewhere by the *Oxford Reformers*, lay the conviction that many points of doctrine were in their nature uncertain and unsettled—that most of the attempted definitions of doctrine, for instance, on such subjects as those involved in the Athanasian Creed, in the Augustinian system, and in scholastic additions to it, were, after all, and in spite of all the ecclesiastical authority in the world, just as unsettled and as uncertain as ever; many of them, in fact, were hypotheses which, in their nature, never can be verified.

On the other hand, the Hussites and Luther—all, in fact, who adopted the Augustinian system—stood on the opposite stand-point. They practically assumed that there was somewhere in the Church an authority capable of establishing an hypothesis.

These considerations must raise our estimate of the need and of the value of the firm stand taken 350 years ago by the Oxford Reformers against this dogmatic power so long dominant in the realm of religious thought. It has been seen in every page of this history that they had taken their stand-point, so to speak, behind that of S. Augustine; behind even the schism between Eastern and Western Christendom; behind those patristic hypotheses which grew up into the scholastic theology; behind that notion of Church authority by which these hypotheses obtained a fictitious verification; behind the theory of "plenary inspiration," without which the Scriptures could not have been converted, as they were, into a mass of raw material for the manufacture of any amount of hypotheses—behind all these, on the simple foundation of fact which underlaid them all. The essential difference between the stand-point of the Protestant and Oxford Reformers Luther had been the first to perceive. And the correctness of this first impression of Luther's has been singularly confirmed by the history of the three and a half centuries of Protestant ascendancy in Western Christendom. The Protestant movement, whilst accomplishing by one revolutionary blow many of the objects which the Oxford Reformers were striving to compass by constitutional means, has been so far antagonistic to their work in other directions as to throw it back—not to say to wipe it out of remembrance—so that in this nineteenth century those Christians who have desired to rest their faith on honest facts, and not on dogmas—on evidence, and not on authority—instead of taking up the work where the Oxford Reformers left it, have had to begin it again at the beginning, as Colet did in Oxford in 1498.

In this view there is both truth and mistake, though there is so much vagueness in the way in which the view is generalized that it is difficult to make much use of it. But what seems to us certain is that if Mr. Seebohm's generalization represents partially, as it does, though only partially, the point of view of Erasmus, it entirely fails to represent adequately that of More, who is classed with him. If More died for anything, he died for the principle of dogma and authority. And so far Mr. Seebohm fails to make out what was that common ground of work which the book is written to prove.

#### DR. CUMMING ON RITUALISM.\*

IF the prophet Jonah, who had been cradled and bred in an atmosphere of miracle—for, according to Jewish tradition, he was the boy raised to life by Elijah and his companion when the celestial fires consumed the sacrifice of Carmel—thought he did

well to be angry when the city he had cursed was not destroyed, we can hardly wonder at the natural indignation of those "minor prophets" of our own day who have been unable to secure the fulfilment of a single prediction, and have neither wrought nor witnessed a single miracle, except indeed the standing miracle that their works are bought by many, and by some readers, who are not denizens of Colney Hatch, appear to be believed. It is very hard that the battle of Armageddon, so often prophesied, recedes like the mirage of the desert, and again and again eludes the dates which are successively fixed for it. In vain has Dr. Cumming announced with startling precision the *Sounding of the Last Trumpet*; in vain has he uttered the *Last Warning Cry*. The trumpet will not sound, and the cry falls on unheeding ears. Yet there is a brighter side to every trial; and so pious a mind as Dr. Cumming's cannot fail to recognise the action of a special providence in the fact that, just as his Apocalyptic resources, or at least the faith of his Apocalyptic votaries, was beginning to be exhausted, and while the tough constitution of Pius IX. is still delaying, beyond all limits of patience or prophecy, the downfall of the Man of Sin, the Ritualists have stepped into the gap. It is difficult even for a prophet to talk for ever without having something to talk about, and the "Protestant Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation," before whom Dr. Cumming is in the habit of "pleasantly" discoursing on Friday evenings in Crown Court, had already got all the errors of Romanism (they are usually reckoned at twenty-five, for practical convenience) at their fingers' ends. But a new crisis has very opportunely arisen. If the world has lasted beyond the period when by all orthodox calculation the millennium ought to have begun, it is something to know that it has not gained much by its perverse tenacity of existence. Dr. Cumming assures us in the preface to his latest work, on *Ritualism the Highway to Rome*, that he is "deeply persuaded that never was our country in greater peril in its highest and holiest interests" than at present. The grounds of this alarming statement may indeed appear to the uninitiated something short of conclusive. It seems that on the 9th of March last the *Weekly Register* expressed its belief that the day was approaching "when High Mass will once more be sung in Westminster Abbey," and Dr. Cumming is so impressed with the prediction that he quotes it in small capitals. Moreover, in the April number of the *Protestant Churchman*, a certain Dr. Blakeney showed, by tabular statistics, the fearful increase of Romish priests, chapels, monasteries, convents, and colleges since 1829, and this increase Dr. Cumming considers to be chiefly the product of Tractarianism and Ritualism. To a secular understanding it might perhaps appear that the removal of civil disabilities and the Irish immigration had a good deal more to do with it, but then Dr. Cumming is quite above taking a secular view of such solemn subjects. He has accordingly come to the rescue with twelve lectures on Ritualism, which have already been given to the world in weekly numbers, but are now reprinted in a volume with "1 Timothy iv. 1-6," standing out in terrible prominence on the centre of the title-page. The words are not quoted, but what reader of his Bible is not at once reminded of that passage, so dear to all Bible Christians, about "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils," which is incontrovertibly proved, by the reference to prohibition of marriage and abstinence from meats, to be aimed at the Babylonish harlot? Nor is the conclusion of the volume less striking than its commencement. The title of the last lecture, "We will not go back to Rome," is happily suggestive of a song which the author, we are sure, is too strict a moralist even to have heard of. Yet he may remember that Charles Wesley protested against the Devil being allowed to have all the good tunes, and we would just throw out the hint whether parts at least of this final discourse might not be metrified and set to the popular melody just referred to. "We'll never go a Rome-ing" would not be a bad refrain for the chorus of a Crown Court hymn. And we would especially commend to Mr. Whalley's attention, next time he is asked to sing, the novel and truly frightful discovery which is announced in this same lecture, that "vast masses of the poor—especially Irish poor—are already Roman Catholics." The statement is dovetailed in between an attack on aristocratic converts to Rome and young men in business who attend "Ritualist ceremonial" (Dr. Cumming is fond of the figure called hendecasylls), so that we are clearly meant to understand that these masses of poor Irish Papists are all of them converts, and the context suggests a horrible suspicion that they were converted at St. Alban's. Let Lord Westmeath take note of it for the next debate on Ritual in the House of Lords.

And now, to say the truth, we must confess to being a little disappointed with this new volume of Dr. Cumming's. It is of course always interesting to hear what so great a prophet has to say about Popery and the Apocalyptic frogs, but then we had heard it so often before that the title of these lectures had induced us to hope for some new application of the spirit of prophecy. But that acute penetration which is part of the prophetic gift detected at a glance—we cannot exactly say the wolf in sheep's clothing, for the clothing is ostentatiously lupine—but the cloven hoof of Rome under the folds of the Anglican chasuble. And though it is very sad to find men who are eating the bread of our Protestant Establishment calling themselves "priests," and using every effort "to convince the people of the truth of Romish dogmas" by means of "rich and varied dresses, which, whether at the ball, or the opera, or a Ritualistic church, are no doubt very attractive," to say nothing

\* *Ritualism the Highway to Rome*. Twelve Lectures by the Rev. J. Cumming, D.D., F.R.S.E. London: Nisbet & Co. 1867.



of candles burning at noon-day, "in the broad light of Protestant Christianity"; yet there is this practical convenience in the turn things have taken, that not only has the prophet got a new subject, but it is one which the old arguments are abundantly sufficient to deal with. Dr. Cumming's triumphant refutation of the doctrine of the Real Presence, which has only the little drawback of being based on a hopeless misconception of what the doctrine is, does not, for instance, strike us as exactly new. We do not merely mean that, so far as there is any point in it, it is borrowed without acknowledgment from Tillotson, but that, if our memory serves us, it has done duty more than once before in the Doctor's learned disquisitions on Popery. But as these naughty Ritualists have reproduced the old "absurdity" of this blasphemous figment, why should he not reproduce his old confutation of it? Still we had hardly expected, under the form of lectures on Ritualism, a mere *rechauffé* of the old anti-Popery argument, and perhaps the Ritualists might think it rather hard that their doings and writings should be so inextricably mixed up with those of the Romanists that it is really impossible to tell, without a careful examination of the context, and not always then, which are being quoted in any given page. It is a little puzzling, again, to those who are destitute of prophetic insight, to find the *Directorium Anglicanum*, which is described as a Ritualistic "Leviticus," made responsible for the wicked Act of Parliament, often referred to in this volume, which permits Roman Catholic priests to officiate in guals, and even—shocking to relate—"to be paid by the local rates according to the work they do." It is due to Dr. Cumming to say that in his generosity he would not have objected so much, apparently, to these Romish chaplains being appointed, as long as no provision was made for their discharging their duties. He has, however, heard of a case—happily there does not seem to be more than one on record—where one of these unreasonable men, not content with a stipend of 70*l.* or 80*l.* a year, wanted also to have the means of doing the work he was paid for. "He said, you must find me an altar; without an altar I cannot get on. I am a priest. So they got him an altar." But even this did not satisfy him, for he then said "You must also find me a *Virgin Mary*. I must have that too. You must also find me *all* the robes of sacrifice." We need hardly observe that by a slight confusion of thought the learned Doctor has identified "a *Virgin Mary*," whatever that may be, with a crucifix. But the remarkable point about this story is that it forms part of an elaborate argument to prove that in the Christian Church, and especially in the Church of England, there are no priests. Not that our author relies altogether on contemporary evidence. He is also an historian, and we have a long extract from the *Apologetics* of Justin Martyr, "who probably saw the Apostle John" (probably, also, if at all, when he was a baby), to prove from what he does not say, that in the Eucharist there is neither transubstantiation nor sacrifice, nor was there at that day any liturgy. It would be unfair to expect Dr. Cumming to know anything of the Popish figment of *disciplina arcani*, yet it might perhaps have occurred to him that it was unsafe to infer much from the reticence of a Christian apologist in the second century, when speaking to a heathen audience of the chief ordinance of his religion. But the strange thing is, that what the passage does contain so little helps his argument that it is a stock quotation with Romanists and Ritualists to prove just the contrary. It not only makes the Eucharist the regular Sunday service of the Church, which Dr. Cumming observes in an off-hand manner was only needed in ages of persecution, but expressly asserts that "the food which is made the Eucharist is both the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus." We are not concerned with Justin Martyr's theology, which may have been sadly corrupted, notwithstanding his interview with the Apostle John in his babyhood; but we cannot help thinking that, if this language had occurred in a sermon preached at St. Alban's, Dr. Cumming would have pounced upon it, not altogether unreasonably, as clear evidence that the Real Presence was being taught there.

Nor is he always more happy in his appreciation of modern theologians. He has two palmary arguments against the Ritualist theory of the apostolic succession, which are these—first, that many bishops have been ordained simoniacally, and therefore their ordination was "null and void from the beginning;" secondly, that some Anglican prelates, and notably "the author of that magnificent specimen of philosophical reasoning, the *Analogy*," were children of Dissenters, and had only dissenting baptism, and therefore, "according to the High Church people," were not Christians at all. And "the accomplished Cardinal Patrizzi" is similarly introduced as addressing the Ritualistic clergy in these words:—"Gentlemen, I must be very candid with you; you need to be baptized, for you have not been baptized at all." Now any child who had learnt a Roman Catholic Catechism, or been taught by these "High Church people," could have told Dr. Cumming that they consider lay baptism to be valid. But he has a shorter way of going to work with them. He does not trust altogether to arguments from early Fathers, or exposure of later inconsistencies. He goes to the root of the matter. Why do the Ritualists want a "sacrifice of the altar" at all? The reason is only too plain. The Ritualistic Deity "is a wrathful, a vengeful, a threatening Being, watching every trip, that He may destroy you, watching every possible fault, that He may send you to hell for ever." And the lecturer asks triumphantly if this Being is "the God of the Bible"? Well, if we must give an opinion, we are inclined to think not. But we have often heard of the view before, and have always heard of it in connexion with what somebody pro-

famely called "the glad tidings of everlasting damnation" in the Gospel of the Calvinists. We seem to recollect a hymn, not composed by a Ritualist, which talks of "the Son who smoothed the angry Father's face." And we have seen a document which Dr. Cumming may possibly have some acquaintance with, where the views he reprobates are affirmed with a candour and precision which, in that respect at least, leaves nothing to be desired. It is not the Thirty-Nine Articles, nor the Catechism of Trent, but—*sit venia verbo*—it is the Westminster Confession! Dr. Cumming, like many excellent people of strong theological proclivities, thinks any stick will do to beat a dog with, and in this particular case he has contrived, in demolishing the Ritualists, to wallop his own nigger with an unconscious energy which is most edifying to behold. After all this it is refreshing to know that he once met in "that exquisite Corinthian structure, La Madeleine," a venerable French canon who was already "a real Christian" and was almost persuaded to complete his conversion by coming to hear "our best Protestant preachers" at Exeter Hall during the month of May. But, on the other hand, the landlord of the Doctor's hotel at Bruges assured him that his "life would not be safe" if he attempted to preach Christ in that benighted city, though the people would be charmed to hear him preach, even in "very bad French," about the Virgin Mary. Still, while he has "spoken faithfully and not minced his words," he knows that there are many Roman Catholics, and even "some priests," who are "sincere and earnest, but misguided men." He will not even go so far as to say that no Romanists "will ever get to heaven," only he feels sure "they will be at a great loss" what to do when they find themselves there.

We are of course aware that there is a serious side to this so-called Ritualist controversy, though it is difficult to remember it with Dr. Cumming's book open before us. If we were to offer any suggestion to the disputants of either school, we would remind them how foolish it is to quarrel about a matter where there must always be such wide scope for differences of taste, and where the Church of England has always allowed so large a latitude of practice, as the externals of religious worship. And if it be replied that the importance of the question lies, not in the ceremonial, but in the doctrinal significance which is attached to it by friend and foe alike, we may further observe that ever since the reign of Elizabeth there have been two great parties in the English Church, and it has been found wide enough to include them both. Once indeed a different policy was attempted, when Archbishop Laud cropped the ears of the Puritans, and the Puritans retaliated by cutting off the Archbishop's head. But the results of the attempt at mutual exclusion were hardly so satisfactory as to make us anxious for its renewal. We are not aware that the party who follow Dr. Pusey's leading have any desire to eject the Evangelicals, and the Evangelicals will remember, if they are wise, that their opponents have, to say the least, as good standing ground as themselves in the Prayer Book to which both parties subscribe.

Meanwhile, perhaps Dr. Cumming might with more advantage turn his attention to the shortcomings of his own communion in Scotland. One of Her Majesty's Inspectors for Schools reported the other day that the children he had examined there, though quite perfect in "the eternal decrees," to which we referred just now, were so densely ignorant of Old Testament history that the only answer he could get from any one in that branch of the Examination came from an exceptionally accomplished little girl, who replied, with a glow of modest intelligence, to the question why Adam and Eve were turned out of Paradise, "Please, sir, because they committed adultery."

#### THE GREAT PYRAMID.\*

NO one who took up the startling book of the Astronomer Royal for Scotland on the Great Pyramid three years ago will be surprised to find that he has come back from an expedition professedly undertaken to sift and verify that astounding hypothesis more prepared than ever to fight for every jot and tittle of the whole complex and intricate tissue of wonders. There are issues on which it is hardly in the nature of man to engage in a perfectly calm and dispassionate spirit, and *Our Inheritance in the Great Pyramid* was about the last book, in point of tone and temper, to encourage a hope of our seeing such points as were really deserving of investigation worked out, as they should be, as a pure matter of archaeological or of scientific interest. There had come to be bound up in the problem, by some inscrutable process of the author's mind, the interests of religion and the integrity of the national faith. The theory itself, which was likely to be captivating enough to a certain class of minds, as it probably took away the breath of all who heard it for the first time, was not indeed wholly original or new. It had grown up by degrees out of surmises and speculations as old as the time of Professor Greaves, two centuries ago, and had culminated in the extraordinary work of the late John Taylor, an amiable and ingenious enthusiast, at whose feet Professor Smyth was first let into the great secret. As his dying legacy, old Mr. Taylor seems to have bequeathed to his young and eager disciple the task of vindicating what he called the "cause."

In the Great Pyramid, that is to say, mankind were to see

\* *Life and Work at the Great Pyramid.* By C. Piazza Smyth, Professor of Practical Astronomy in the University of Edinburgh, and Astronomer Royal for Scotland. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas. 1867.

embodied, under divine inspiration, an absolute standard to all time of length, weight, and capacity, based upon mathematical, cosmical, and astronomical facts of the utmost precision and delicacy. The entire structure was pervaded by this magic rule of proportion, which was, however, expressed more emphatically in the porphyry coffer in the central or King's chamber. And what should this faultless and more than human standard turn out to be but our own dear old British inch, which is always giving our men of science such trouble to settle; while the coffer itself was the identical vessel of which one-fourth of the cubical capacity has through all the ages come down to us in the "quarter" of the British farmer! Thus in the Great Pyramid we "inherited" a kind of sealed book of witness against that mystery of iniquity, the decimal system, which was to be traced backwards to Cain, and which would be certain to bring with it into our favoured land the whole flood of atheism and ungodliness of which the French Revolution was but a transient and a minor wave. Other truths without number of a geometrical and astronomical kind were likewise to be traced in the sides, angles, and passages of this remarkable monument; all, however, subsidiary in meaning and importance to this "wonder within a wonder." Here Egyptologists, and profane or sceptical persons generally, might see nothing more than a dead king's sarcophagus; but to the initiated it became nothing less than a witness to the truth of Holy Writ, and a bulwark against the arts of Satan. Critics might smile or scoff, but the propounders of this theory were terribly in earnest. Professor Smyth, on whom the prophet's mantle was felt to have fallen, has from that time thrown into the mission all the resources of his scientific training, and all the weight of his professional name. This at once lends to the matter a more serious import, and we are disposed to look into it with more care and gravity than we should feel bound to bestow upon the crotchets of an obscure and irresponsible scribbler. We have now before us the results of five months spent, in company with Mrs. Piazza Smyth, in laborious measurements on the spot, which the author has since reduced, with all the pains and skill at his command, to a vast and symmetrical system of proof. As we expected, these results are brought forth as a triumphant verification of his former work at every point. But what will be their effect upon other minds, or upon the public at large? It is not without a feeling of pain that we think of the outlay of time and money that is embodied in the three handsome volumes of *Life and Work at the Great Pyramid*. What is, after all, their scientific or logical value?

The heat which the work displays throughout, the rhetorical style, the frantic appeals to religious and national prejudices, might well give rise to mistrust as to the writer's power to deal dispassionately with facts. With sceptical or even scrupulous minds, the same mistrust might attach itself to the facts themselves. In the ruinous state of almost every portion of the pyramid every one must know how vague and indeterminate the best observations must unavoidably be, as the huge discrepancies between the published lists suffice to indicate. What are we then to think of measurements professing accuracy to tenths of seconds or two places of decimals, especially when the observer cannot look through an eyepiece or handle a micrometer without having in his mind the precise angle he has for years been burning to bring out? There need be no question here of the observer's good faith. Calmness and self-control, as life in an observatory should be the very thing to inculcate, are prime co-efficients of weight even in the purest of the sciences. We are, however, quite content to take the facts and figures as they are given us, holding ourselves at liberty to comment upon the results to be founded upon them. These results, given out on high professional authority, might well strike the mind at first with a kind of vertigo. But we will endeavour to get over the shock, and go with all possible calmness into some of the leading parts of the stupendous theory. To test the strength of every link in this chain of marvels is beyond our scope. Yet no chain is stronger than its weakest link, and the strongest chain must depend after all on the soundness of the peg from which it is made to hang. Of the professional skill displayed in the manipulation of this mass of figures it is difficult to speak too highly. More is the pity that we should be reminded so constantly throughout of that peculiar kind of skill which has been made distressingly familiar to us by the evidence of "experts" in medical cases and patent suits.

The main strength of the great metrological theory centred unquestionably in the so-called "porphyry coffer" in the King's chamber. Other pyramids contain in their central chambers vessels of stone, not very different in size or shape, the purpose of which has never been disputed. They were sarcophagi for receiving the mummied corpse of the builder of the pyramid. Thus much was clear, though no trace remained of the body itself, from the grooves or channels extending along three sides of the vessel, for the purpose of sliding on the lid, as also from certain pin-holes on the fourth side for holding the lid in its place. This arrangement is recognised by all in the sarcophagi of the Second and Third Pyramids. But the mysterious coffer of the Great Pyramid, we were told, could be for no sepulchral purpose. What marked it out from all the rest was the absence of any lid, or of any trace of a lid having ever been there. This was the first crucial test of its mystic significance. Next, everything depended upon its being a "figure of five sides." The pyramid itself had five sides, it was argued, the base counting for one. It had in like manner five corner-stones, the topmost one being no other than the "chief

corner-stone" indicated by holy writ. Thus, in the case of that "wonder within a wonder," the royal coffer, the Professor was bold enough *à priori* to risk all upon its having neither more nor less than five sides:—

We may even say that it could not have been otherwise, and that is at once an explanation why all the searching of all the nations of the world during the last five hundred years has never been able to find that coffer's fancied lid. A lid would have been a sixth side!

We have now to follow the Professor as, big with the formula on which turns the whole metrological value of the pyramid, "five as a number, times of five, and powers of five," he raced up the royal gallery and turned the light of his hand-lamp upon the mystic vessel of so many dreams. What met his eye might well be called a feature of "most revolutionary character":—

The western side of the coffer is, through almost its entire length, rather lower than the other three, and these have grooves inside, or the remains of grooves once cut into them, about an inch or two below their summits, and on a level with the western edge; in fact, to admit a sliding sarcophagus cover, or lid; and there were the remains of three fixing pin-holes on the western side for fastening such cover into its place.

Well may the Professor say, "The import of all this struck us almost dumb for a time." Of course his presence of mind returns, and he is far too clever and full of pluck to be permanently put out by such a slap in the face. Common or profane minds would be apt to say at once that it was all up with the coffer theory. But no! There has been some sinister modern agency at work. "This modification must have been worked in the coffer in the course of the present century." The French Academicians, oddly enough, passed lightly over these groove-marks, though their engraving shows a cover which may have been conjectural, with two oval bosses or handles at each end, whereas the marks are distinctly laid down by Mr. Perring in Colonel Howard Vyse's work published in 1837-9. Who then can have been the miscreant who has done this wrong to "the cause"? Could it have been the French atheists themselves? We wonder the Professor does not ascribe it at once to the direct handiwork of the Father of Lies.

It must have been some comfort to the Professor that the lid was not to be found, added to which he had his revenge in pitching into a hole in the floor the lump of stone wherewith cockney travellers have from time immemorial been wont to bang the sides of the poor coffer, and which stone may have formed part of the missing cover itself. This disappearance of the lid goes with us for nothing. A fragment remains in the case of the Second Pyramid. In neither has the least vestige of the royal corpse been preserved. Who indeed can say how long it was after the granite portcullis closed upon the mummy of King Shofor or Cheops before sacrilegious hands broke in in search of the treasure known to be buried there? We have it on the evidence of papyri that tombs of the eighteenth dynasty were already ransacked by men of the twentieth, and Dr. Samuel Birch has translated and published a record of the trial and punishment of certain priests of Ammon for a similar deed of profanity. But this is not the only hitch that this untoward discovery of a lid having existed introduces into the coffer theory. Are the cubic contents to be calculated with the lid on or off? Are we to measure up to the top of the vessel's side, or only to the level of the groove? How will it fare with Messrs. Taylor and Smyth's hypothetical standard, calculated to an inch without any abatement on the score of a lid, if we are now to knock off some 3,000 cubic inches from its exquisite proportions? Happily there is no end to the resources of a clever master of figures. There is first an indefinite allowance to be made for the space nefariously cut away for the sham groove. Then the surfaces within and without are so strangely wide from that precision of plane and angle which we should have looked for in a standard of these pretensions as greatly to humour the measuring-rod. Have not previous authorities so trustworthy as Professor Greaves, the French Academicians, and Colonel Vyse differed among themselves to an extent equivalent to 6,000 cubic inches in bulk? Besides this, the edges are chipped away nearly all round to a terrible extent, and the angles were clearly never more truly squared than the ordinary specimens of Egyptian work we are accustomed to see in our museums. Well, after minute measurements without end, what do we get as the real inside dimensions of this defaced and irregular box? After much manipulating and striking of means, Professor Smyth's figures for length, breadth, and depth come out in British inches—77.93, 26.73, and 34.34. But why are we left to the pains of putting these numbers together for ourselves in order to get at the cubic contents? Is it because 71,875.9 is so awkwardly far off from 70,970.2, which we are told to expect as "the true, because the theoretically proved, contents of the coffer"? Even when disguised in terms of that highly elastic and hypothetical something, the "pyramid inch," there is a gap here between theory and fact which is not easily got over by any but the thick and thin partisan of a foregone conclusion.

The word Pyramid, we were told to our amazement in the previous book, was compounded of *πυρός*, "wheat," and *μετρον*, "measure." Troy weight, which in our simplicity we used to trace to Troyes in France, spoke of the "trough" or coffer as a standard of weight, though we were not aware that corn was generally meted by pounds Troy. In like manner, the chaldron of four quarters was unconsciously inherited by the British farmer from the same "hot bath"-shaped vessel of King Shofor. We now take a further step in etymology. That science, in such hands as those of Professor Smyth, proves capable of exploits



not less startling than his feats in mensuration or arithmetic. The real roots of the word Pyramid are to be found, we learn, in the Coptic *pyr*, "division," and *met*, "ten," and its meaning is a "division into ten." From this point of view the great object of the book becomes that of bringing out the arithmetical principle of division into tens, or rather fives and multiples and powers of five, as pervading the pyramid throughout. The entire pyramid system was based, we are to believe, upon the builder's knowledge, to an inch, of the earth's axis of rotation—the distance, i.e., from the North to the South Pole. This distance, we need scarcely say, has never been measured since, and is not indeed capable of direct measurement by man, being merely a matter of inference from superficial measurements of the meridian. And the great uncertainty even of the best measures has been made abundantly clear by the corrections that have been already found necessary in the French metric system. The Polar axis, somehow found, was divided into five hundred million parts, one of which was taken as the standard pyramid inch, twenty-five of which went to a sacred cubit. It is queer that nowhere do we meet with whole multiples or round numbers of these figures in the setting out of the pyramid's dimensions. Nor do the integers agree even approximately with such actual cubit measures of wood or stone as are preserved in our museums. Neither, without a good deal of humouring, do they come near the lengths worked out by independent calculators from Newton to Lepsius. However, Messrs. Taylor and Smyth have satisfied themselves that the sacred cubit, unknown as it is to Egyptologists, was equivalent to 25.07 British inches exactly. Combined with this amazing knowledge of the earth's size and shape was that of the earth's mean density and mean temperature, which must needs enter as co-efficients into any mathematically precise standard of length, weight, and capacity:—

This theory is shortly, as regards the kind of standards now under discussion—that a cubic space is to be formed, with sides having a length equal to the one-ten-millionth of the earth's axis of rotation, or 50 Pyramid inches. A tenth part of such space—or 12,500 cubic inches (agreeably with the Coptic interpretation of the name of Pyramid), is then to be filled with matter of the mean density or specific gravity of the earth as a whole. In which case, such a mass will form the grand weight standard of the Pyramid; while the space occupied by an equal weight of pure water, at a given temperature—will form the grand capacity standard of the Great Pyramid; or, as we believe, will represent, and be represented by, the cubic contents of the hollow of the coffer; but this is the point to be tested by actual measure and calculation.

Knowing perfectly well, as we did, that the answer had been worked out long ago from the depths of Mr. Taylor's inner consciousness, we might have been spared this appeal to the test of "actual measure and calculation" as a superfluous, albeit innocent, bit of by-play. We are of course expected to go into fits of consternation at the extraordinary coincidence apparent in the result. But before being carried away by our feelings we should like to be sure how we have got to the most important facts of the series. Can we so far rely upon our ridiculously limited means of getting at the surface heat of the whole earth as to render a mean so struck a trustworthy premiss in so delicate a question of cosmical fact? And to which of our accredited and independent authorities are we to turn for the true figure of the earth's mean density? Had we taken Mr. Airy's determination of 5.565, we should have got 76,500, not 70,938, for the number of cubic inches in the coffer, while Sir Henry James's 5.316 would have brought them down to 68,700. We should never have got on at this rate, and it is hardly fair to chide us, as our Professor hints, "for not waiting contentedly for a few centuries more." So it is better to have our sensation at once. It is a difficult point, we are told, to fix this provoking density, and "hundreds of years may pass away before the best philosophers will have determined it from the earth. But a very moderate man may determine it from the coffer." The italics, which are the author's, not ours, may do much to let the cat out of the bag. Rather than that the theory should be kept waiting, by all means let the theory propound its own figure. Let us take the required number 5.70, as the quantity "indicated within very narrow limits by the coffer." It only remains to box once more the logical compass, and we shall get out of the coffer, by a similar *petitio principii*, our remaining desideratum, the mean temperature. A pound should be, by the theory, "five cubic inches of matter of the density of 5.70 at the temperature of 68° Fahrenheit, that being one-fifth the interval between the freezing and boiling point of water." Now here, we are told, is "one of the most curious parts of the whole pyramid question." A more curious part, to our humble thinking, is that an Astronomer Royal should so complacently have fixed the temperature of the King's chamber at the constant of 68° Fahrenheit, when his own meteorological journal during the five winter months yields no lower reading for air temperature than 74.3°, and we see no reason to suspect any change of climate since the days of King Shofa. It must be far pleasanter, though, to settle questions of temperature, free from the dust and heat of Egypt, in the peaceful coolness of the Edinburgh Observatory.

(To be continued.)

#### HANNAH LIGHTFOOT AND DR. WILMOT.\*

DESTRUCTIVE criticism has its charms, and it would be hard if it were not so. The work must be done, if the world is not to be oppressed beneath the rank overgrowth of

\* *Hannah Lightfoot; Queen Charlotte and the Chevalier d'Éon; Dr. Wilmot's Polish Princess.* By W. J. Thoms, F.S.A. London: W. G. Smith, 1867.

falsehood; but traditional fallacies and mysterious romances have so strong an attraction for the multitude that the man who attacks them is too likely to be left to cry unheeded in the wilderness. It is well then that iconoclasm is, to some extent, its own reward. In throwing down the idols of the senate-house and the market-place Lord Bacon felt doubtless a satisfaction akin to that which the natural man would feel in avenging a personal injury. The pretence of knowledge without the reality may fairly excite, not only contempt, but indignation. If the mistake be one which hitherto it has been impossible to correct, no very strong feelings may be roused in us when we are set free from it. But it is quite otherwise when we find that others have been striving to keep up the delusion; and it will make but little difference whether they have done so with their eyes open, or with all the sincerity of honest conviction. The truth is that the overthrowing of a falsehood is really an enlargement of our knowledge, and we know so much the more when we have determined, on adequate proof, that certain articles of popular belief are not true. With the pleasure thus received there may be mingled other causes for satisfaction. The exposure of falsehood may scatter the shadows which have rested on the good name of the living or the dead, or it may reveal in its true aspect the character of men of whom the world has thought too well. But the detection of a lie is still further of use, as giving us, with each successful application of our method, fresh confidence in the principles upon which that method is based; and it is from this point of view that the myths which connected the name of George III. with Dr. Wilmot have something of a permanent importance.

The story told of George III. is a very strange story indeed, not so much for the incidents with which the fable was originally embellished, as for the complicated web of fictions with which it has been ingeniously interwoven. On the tissue of contradictions with which the whole legend is covered, we need not now dwell; but we may fairly note the cleverness of the device which made Dr. Wilmot the instrument in carrying out the wishes of the King. As first put forth, the tale spoke only of the Prince's love for a beautiful Quaker, named Wheeler; but Miss Wheeler soon became Hannah Lightfoot; and, according to one version, the discovery of the amour resulted in her being forced to marry a grocer, while, according to another, which sought to clear the King's moral character, the Prince determined to marry her himself. But although the public were soon regaled with some choice incidents of the courtship, and although they were duly taught by one version that Hannah lived for some weeks with her plebeian husband and was then spirited away, and by another that until her disappearance she remained in the keeping of her Royal lover who in his misery sent Lord Chatham in disguise to search for his lost mistress, the idea of connecting this legend with that of the Princess of Cumberland seems not to have struck any one until the rumour which represented Queen Caroline as convinced that the King had married Hannah Lightfoot had been set afloat. The Queen, it is said, on discovering this fact, insisted on being remarried herself, forgetting apparently that the iteration of the ceremony would be of not much use during the lifetime of the true wife, who was affirmed to be not yet dead. She insisted also that the ceremony should be performed by Dr. Wilmot. Now, Dr. Wilmot, according to the testimony of a lady deeply interested in the result of her schemes, was the author of the Letters of Junius, and the bosom-friend not only of many among the highest noblemen in the land, but also of Stanislaus, King of Poland, whose sister he married. No union, we are told, could be more blissfully happy, but cruel circumstances soon separated them, and a daughter only remained to cheer him in the solitude of his rectory at Barton on the Heath. This daughter, as she grew up into womanhood, excited the admiration of the Duke of Cumberland and the Earl of Warwick; but the Earl gracefully giving precedence to his Royal friend, the daughter of the Polish Princess became the wife of an English Prince of the Blood. But here again the fates were unkind. The marriage was never made public, and the transaction which prevented this vindication of her name gave her, it is said, a shock from which she never recovered. The wretched woman died heartbroken in a French convent, leaving to her daughter the legacy of the lofty claims which have been lately pressed in vain by her granddaughter, Mrs. Olivia Wilmot Serres.

All these events are of course duly attested. Indeed the certificates fly about us thick as leaves in Vallombrosa. Dr. Wilmot, who remarries Queen Caroline to her husband, declares that on April 17, 1759, he solemnized in Kew Chapel the marriage of the Prince with Hannah Lightfoot, who simply subscribes herself Hannah beneath the George P. of the Prince. Six weeks later the same Dr. Wilmot kindly repeats the ceremony for them, "at their residence at Peckham," in the presence of the same witnesses, William Pitt and Anne Taylor, but the fair Quaker now gives her surname as well as her Christian name, while the Prince is careful to style himself George Guelph.

We are thus brought face to face with the monstrous contradictions which run through every one of these narratives. Dr. Wilmot, who testifies that his daughter Olive was married by him to the Duke of Cumberland, was, according to the version first put out, never married at all. True, he knew the Princess of Poland, who esteemed him very highly during her visit to England, and invited him to the Court of Poland; but here the matter seems to have ended, for in 1817 Mrs. Serres, in her pamphlet entitled *Junius, Sir Philip Francis Denied*, grounds part of her argument for attributing the letters to Wilmot on the circumstance of his never having married. Four years later she had become better

informed. Far from being a celibate during his whole life, Dr. Wilmot now becomes the husband of the Princess Poniatowski, while he still continues Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. As, according to Mrs. Serres, the Princess gave birth to her daughter in 1750, it is to be supposed that the marriage took place in the previous year; but it is strange that Dr. Wilmot, so lavish of papers affecting the marriages of others, has made not the slightest note of his own. He has not only not told us when he was married, or where, but he has even left us ignorant of the name of his bride. Mrs. Serres, it seems, had to grope her way to the truth through difficult and thorny paths, and her efforts to extricate herself are sometimes exceedingly unfortunate. At one time we are told that Dr. Wilmot married a daughter of Stanislaus, last King of Poland; at another, that he married that King's sister. It is again unlucky that Stanislaus was never married, and that, even if he had been, he could not, having been born in 1732, have been the father of a marriageable daughter in 1749; nor could this daughter have been in that year Princess of Poland, her father, if he was her father, being then only Count Poniatowski, and his election to the Kingdom of Poland not taking place till 1764. But as Dr. Wilmot's wife could not be the daughter of the Polish noble, so neither, unhappily, could she be his sister; for Stanislaus had, as is definitely ascertained, only two sisters, and of these the elder was married to one of the Zamoyski family and left a daughter, who became the wife of a Count Mniszech, while the younger was married to Clement Branicki, and died without having any children.

We know not, then, either when or where this mythical princess was married to the future rector of Aulcester and Barton; but unhappily, again, the historian or mythopoeist has been too careful in the matter of dates. The birth of Dr. Wilmot's daughter is discreetly stated to have taken place on June 17, 1750; the birth of the Princess Olive is described more particularly as occurring on Tuesday, April 3, 1772. But unluckily the 3rd of April in that year was Friday, not Tuesday; nor could it be a mistake for the 13th, which was Monday, or the 23rd, which was Friday. The error is, however, soon traced to its source. The chronologer felt bound to make the calculation according to the old style, under which the day would have been Tuesday; but the calculation was mere labour lost, for the style had been changed twenty years earlier.

The dates given in the story of Hannah Lightfoot are of two kinds, some belonging to the accounts of her union with the grocer, others being attested by the signatures of Lords Chatham, Warwick, and Archer. They all refute themselves. According to one version, she eloped in 1754, and was married to Isaac Ashford in Keith's chapel; but unless the ceremony was performed before March 25 of that year, the marriage would be void, as marriages in this chapel ceased from that day. According to another, she was married, not to the grocer, but to the King, and this not in 1754 in Keith's chapel, but in 1759 at Kew, and again in their private house at Peckham; nor has any certificate of the Keith's chapel marriage ever been found. The dates of her marriage with the Prince, if not directly set aside, are brought into the gravest possible suspicion by evidence which cannot be disputed. May 27, 1759, was a Sunday—a day, to use Mr. Thoms's words, "rather unlikely for a young prince to select for absentsing himself from his family for the purpose of getting married"; but the day was also an anxious one for Pitt, for on the following day he writes to Mr. Grenville from Hayes, to announce "Lady Hester's safe delivery that morning of a son." But Pitt, now Lord Chatham, was on March 4, 1767, a witness to the marriage of the Duke of Cumberland with Olive Wilmot; yet on the day before, March 3, he had been obliged to get his wife to write to the King, and say that "he is most unhappy to continue out of a condition to attend His Majesty's most gracious presence"; and again, three days later, the King writes to inquire about the Earl's health, and to insist on his not coming out until he can do so with safety. What then has become of their happy meeting on the 4th? It fares even worse with the document which is dated May 21, 1774, creating Olive Duchess of Lancaster. This paper is countersigned by Lord Chatham at St. James's, and yet on that very day the Earl left Burton Pines, where he had been the guest of Lord Stanhope; and as he had been staying there for a long time, he could not, Mr. Thoms maintains, have countersigned the documents of the 1st and 2nd of May.

Such are a few of the difficulties and contradictions which run through this mass of legend as analysed by Mr. Thoms. From whatever point we approach them, the stories crumble beneath our touch. In some instances, as in the scandal which connects the name of Queen Charlotte with the Chevalier d'Eon, we have the best possible refutation in the confession of the inventor himself. In none have we a single statement or document which can stand the test of a rigorous scrutiny. Times, names, and places are confused or changed with that convenient facility which Sir Cornwall Lewis ascribed to the method of Egyptologists. Yet there is no doubt whatever of the existence of George III. or the Duke of Cumberland, of Dr. Wilmot or King Stanislaus. There is nothing in itself improbable or impossible in the circumstance that even George III. should fall in love with a Quaker, or that a Royal duke should marry the daughter of a Warwickshire rector. But the stories fall to pieces as soon as they are compared with each other. They carry their condemnation on their face when we find that there are two or more versions of every incident, that some of the statements can be demonstrably disproved, and that all the evidence at our command points in quite

another direction. There was no lack of libertinage in the family of George III., and there was no indisposition in Horace Walpole to circulate scandals hence arising. Yet at the very time when the intrigue with Hannah Lightfoot was going on, Walpole speaks of Prince George as bigoted, young, and chaste; and it is inconsistent with all that we know of his character, with his faults as well as with his better qualities, that he should have consciously told an untruth when, speaking years afterwards of the Prince of Wales's connexion with Mrs. Robinson, he added, "I am happy at being able to say that I never was personally engaged in such a transaction, which perhaps makes me feel this the stronger." When we remember further that not a hint of any one of these stories was breathed during his long reign of sixty years, we feel that the demolition of a house of sand could not be more complete. To plunge the whole matter into bathos, some five or six families wholly unconnected with each other are made to affiliate themselves on George III. through the fair Quaker, variously named Wheeler, Lightfoot, and Whitefoot.

The romance which Mr. Thoms has dissected with ruthless thoroughness belongs to a period of contemporary history; but, after all, it only points the moral which belongs to all times alike, that when we have many contradictory accounts of the same incidents, all must be cast aside unless we have some solid grounds for preferring one to the rest. It matters not whether we are dealing with historical facts or with interpretations of dead languages or forgotten alphabets. We have three or four wholly contradictory accounts of the Decemviral legislation, and of the exploits of Sesostris and Semiramis; we have several descriptions of the Egyptian hieroglyphic writing, which are altogether discordant; but, while we have "no sufficient reason for selecting any one of these systems, we are compelled by the laws of historical evidence to reject them all." This is practically the conclusion of Mr. Thoms, as of Sir Cornwall Lewis. Both alike are wholly opposed to the method which, in spite of contradictions or impossibilities, still clings to the idea of an ascertainable historical residuum. Both will have nothing to do with that *caput mortuum* which seems to have so strange a charm for Dr. Dyer and Mr. Blackie:—

The Prince saw her (Hannah) as he went from Leicester House to St. James's. No, that's wrong; it was as he went to the Opera. No, you are both wrong; it was as he went to the Parliament House.

Never mind where he saw her; he did see her and fell in love with her; and as neither his mother the Princess Dowager nor Lord Bute looked after him, and he was then nearly sixteen years old, he married her in 1754. No, that's not right; it was in 1759.

But it does not matter when he married; he did marry her at Keith's Chapel in Mayfair. No, it was at Peckham. No, it was at Kew.

No, that is all a mistake; her Royal lover never married her.—P. 22.

For Hannah, let us read Helen; for Prince George, Paris; for Kew and Peckham, Ilium and Sparta, and we have a method in every particular identical with that which Mr. Blackie, in his recently published volumes on Homer and the Iliad, applies to the Trojan war. Of the details of that war we know nothing; Paris may have seen Helen at Sparta or elsewhere, or he may never have gone to Sparta at all; Helen may or may not have been the cause of the war; but, somewhere or other, Paris saw Helen and ran away with her, and something unpleasant was the consequence. What became of her or of him nobody knows, and as to Agamemnon and Achilles, some say that they were leaders in the same expedition, that they quarrelled, that their quarrel led to great disaster, and their reconciliation to final victory; while others will have it that they were at the head of successive undertakings, all of which had for their object the overthrow of Troy. But it does not really matter whether they met or did not meet. A war there was of some sort or other, fought out in some place, and with some result unknown.

If we reject a series of self-contradictory stories relating to a time for which we have full contemporary registration, on what grounds are contradictory tales relating to periods which admit of the application of no test whatever deserving of any greater credit or consideration?

#### PUISEUX'S SIEGE OF ROUEN.\*

WE are delighted to see M. Puisseux at last putting forth something which may be called a book. M. Puisseux's former contributions to Norman history, important as they have been, have still been, in point of form, mere pamphlets. But the *Siege et Prise de Rouen* reaches 301 pages, and its whole appearance, paper, and printing, does great credit to its local publisher. In fact, in the matter of publishing, France is less centralized than England. Practically, no book within the British Isles is published anywhere but in London. Books are indeed published at the English Universities and at the Scottish and Irish capitals; but the publishers of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, and Dublin, have London branches or London agencies which in effect bring their wares into the class of London publications. No one would now think of publishing a book, except of the most purely local kind, at Bristol or Birmingham. It was not so a generation or two back; it still is not so in France. If we listened only to the talk of Paris, we might fancy that there was nothing in all France except Paris. So to believe would be to trust Paris much more

\* *Siege et Prise de Rouen par les Anglais (1418-1419) principalement d'après un Poème anglais contemporain.* Par M. L. Puisseux. Caen: E. Le Gost-Clerisse. 1867.



than Paris deserves. There is still a great deal of sound and healthy life in other parts of that vast aggregate of ancient States which we call France. It shows itself especially in this matter of publishing books. Very valuable French books are to be had which never saw Paris in their lives, which bear the name of Rouen or Bordeaux in their title-pages, without so much as a Parisian agency. There is no doubt more of show and glitter to be found in the great capital on the Seine, but we suspect that there is quite as much sound learning to be found in other places. And the old University town of Caen certainly does not lag behind. As it boasts of more than one eminent scholar ready to instruct his generation, so it boasts also of more than one enterprising bookseller ready to send forth their writings for the benefit, if not of Paris, at any rate of Normandy and England.

We rejoice then that M. Puisieux has at last written a book, and that not merely because of the value of the book itself, but because we venture to look upon it as the earnest of a greater book. We wish to see him work up the materials of his various detached *études*—we believe that is the proper name—into a connected history of the Hundred Years' War. For that task M. Puisieux is pre-eminently the man. The great struggle between France and England is the subject which has attracted his constant attention, and about which he probably knows more than any other man living. An Aquitanian by birth, a Norman by feeling and long residence, a Frenchman ready to do thorough justice to England past and present, M. Puisieux is the man of all others to record the exploits of Edward the Black Prince and of Henry of Monmouth.

We should hardly have thought that the Siege of Rouen, a siege which, after all, does not present any very striking incidents, could have furnished the materials of so interesting a narrative as M. Puisieux has certainly made of it. He has done so mainly by his clear statement of the several positions of all the parties concerned, and by the extreme care which he bestows on every local detail. We thus get thoroughly acquainted with all the persons and all the places with which the story is concerned. The siege itself was little more than a blockade. Henry, with a generalship which M. Puisieux carefully marks out, did not attack Rouen till he was sure of success. The capital of Normandy was nearly the last point of Normandy of which he took possession. He had held Harfleur ever since his first invasion; he had occupied most of the other chief towns of the Duchy; he now took Louviers and Pont de l'Arche, which cut off communication with Paris as Harfleur cut off all communication with the sea; he made a singular treaty with Caudebec, which was to observe neutrality for the present, and to surrender if Rouen did. The city was thus hemmed in in all directions except that of Picardy, even before the English set down before it. Henry had simply to wait till Rouen surrendered, and he no doubt expected that it would surrender much sooner than it did. The siege began at the end of June 1418, and the city surrendered through sheer pressure of hunger in January 1419. So desperate a resistance could hardly have been looked for. France was at that moment torn in pieces by the Burgundian and Armagnac factions. Only a year before its siege by the King of England, Rouen had undergone a siege in a domestic quarrel at the hands of the Dauphin of France. The citizens of Rouen sided with the Burgundians, the bailiff, Raoul de Gaucourt, had been murdered as an Armagnac partisan, and Alan Blanchart, the hero of the great siege, was charged with a share in the deed. The defenders of Rouen were strong on the Burgundian side, and the Duke of Burgundy, John the Fearless, was certainly in at least secret negotiation with Henry. But the idea of submission to the English King, except under the pressure of sheer physical necessity, seems never to have presented itself to either the garrison or the citizens. It is really wonderful that it did not; we are rather surprised to find that Henry had not a party, if not in the rest of France, at all events in Normandy. The French Government was at the moment thoroughly worthless; it wholly failed to discharge any of the duties of government; it left its subjects utterly without protection of any kind. The whole land in short was reduced to such a state of simple anarchy that one would have thought that a conqueror like Henry, whose rule promised to be stern certainly, but just and vigorous, would really have been welcomed as a deliverer. And, setting aside Henry's fantastic claim to the Crown of France, in which however he himself seems honestly to have believed, there was no doubt as to his being the representative of the ancient Dukes. No one would probably have thought of such a subtlety as that the Earl of March had a fairer claim to the Duchy than the King. In his twofold character of Duke of Normandy and King of France, Henry seems to have really persuaded himself that Rouen was his lawful possession, and that those who held it against him were doing him a great wrong. He always speaks of the city as his city, and of its defenders as rebels. He could thus persuade himself that every act of severity was an act of justice, and that every act of mercy was an act of unmerited favour. This explains at once the harshness and the graciousness of Henry's demeanour throughout. In his own eyes, he was simply recovering his own. And harsh, and even cruel, as many of his acts seem to us, they were incomparably less cruel than the dealings of the French factions with one another.

It is clear also that Henry, though he claimed the Crown of France as well as the Duchy of Normandy, drew a marked distinction between Normandy and the rest of France. This was plainly shown in the articles of capitulation of Rouen itself. The

French were dealt with simply as enemies. The French soldiers were to give up their arms, horses, and so forth, and to swear not to serve for a year against the King of England; on these terms they were let go free. But the native Normans were dealt with in a way at once better and worse. The city, as a city, retained all the privileges which had been granted to it either by the ancient Dukes of Normandy or by the Kings of France before Philip of Valois. The later Kings were looked on as usurpers, and their acts were held for null. The individual citizens were called on to take the oath of allegiance to Henry as their natural sovereign. Those who consented retained all their property and rights undisturbed, as good and loyal subjects. Those who refused were held for rebels and detained as prisoners. Henry did not even scruple, both at Rouen and elsewhere, to execute some of his most obstinate opponents as traitors. In the capitulation of Rouen nine persons were exempted from its terms, and were left to the King's mercy. Most of them obtained their liberty on payment of ransoms; but the Canon and Vicar-General, Robert de Livet, who had publicly excommunicated Henry from the walls, underwent a long imprisonment in England, and the brave captain of the cross-bowmen, Alan Blanchart, was hanged. He was, as we have seen, charged with a share in the murder of Raoul de Gaucourt, and he may have been partly sacrificed as a victim to the Dauphin, with whom Henry was now again opening negotiations.

But, with all that might be said on Henry's side, he does not appear, as yet at least, to have found any but unwilling subjects even in Normandy. We say as yet, because, after the Treaty of Troyes, there was a strong party in France zealous in the English interest. But we doubt whether there ever was, strictly speaking, an English party. The alliance between Henry and the Dukes of Burgundy made the Burgundian party incidentally English; but when Philip the Good made his peace with France, it became plain how slight was the hold of England upon its conquests. Henry the Fifth, had he lived, might possibly have attached a party to himself personally; so might John of Bedford, if he had not been so thwarted everywhere. But no one could feel any attachment to those who came after him, and all traces of an English party died out wherever the English were merely conquerors, at Rouen as much as anywhere else. It is curious to find so strong a French national feeling combined with a strong Norman feeling. Considering how many points of distinction Normandy retains still, the speed with which it became French in political feeling is very remarkable.

The most curious and the most shocking incident of the siege is the expulsion of the "useless mouths," when hunger began to be felt in the city. The old men and women and children, but, as M. Puisieux points out, those only who were not burghers of the city, were driven out. Henry refused them a passage through his lines, on the plea that they might go and reveal the arrangements of the English camp. The poor wretches had therefore to stay in the ditches, where they died in crowds through lack of food and the cold of the winter. Each side charged the other with this cruelty. Henry affirmed that it was no fault of his; it was the Rouen people themselves who had done the deed. And it does appear that the English soldiers gave them some food stealthily, that the King fed the whole body openly on Christmas Day, and that in the capitulation he insisted on their being at once received again into the town. The English poet, who is M. Puisieux's chief authority, extols Henry's conduct as a marvel of mercy. M. Puisieux himself suspects that his object was to bring the garrison and citizens to surrender the sooner by seeing the wretchedness of their countrymen.

We are amused here and there in M. Puisieux's present work, by little flourishes about "French nationality" and the like, to which we should not think for a moment of objecting or even calling attention, if they did not strike us as something new in M. Puisieux, who hitherto has so emphatically written not as a Frenchman but as a Norman. M. Puisieux is a Government official—in France, unhappily, a Professor must be called a Government official. Has he been told "par autorité supérieure," that this sort of thing will not do, and that Normandy must be merged in the glory of the "grande nation"? We have not forgotten how a patriotic Prefect commanded "La Guienne Anglaise" to be changed, out of patriotic motives, into "La Guienne militaire," and the game which was played at Bordeaux may be also played at Caen. Still it is a comfort to think that nothing but a general massacre can get rid of all the honest Teutonic countenances of which the Bessin and the Côtentin are still full.

In his general treatment of the subject, M. Puisieux keeps, we think, a fair mean between the tone of Lord Brougham, who is as usual over hard, and the tone of Henry's extravagant panegyrist Mr. Tyler. This last writer cuts the story amusingly short, for fear of harrowing his readers' feelings. But he helps us to one curious fact—namely, that everybody in England did not approve of Henry's doings in France. "One Glomyng was charged with having said, 'What doth the King of England at siege before Rouen? An I were there with three thousand men, I would break his siege and make them of Rouen dock his tail.' He said moreover that 'he was not able to abide there, were it not that the Duke of Burgundy kept his enemies from him.'"

We part again from M. Puisieux, earnestly hoping that, some day or other, we may have the pleasure of reviewing a History of the Hundred Years' War from his hand.

## THE MEANS AND THE END.\*

THE full title of this work is *The Means and the End; or, the Chaplain's Secret; a Tale in which Ritualism and its Errors are traced to their Source*; and it requires no great experience to infer, from the title, the whole character of the novel. We do not mean to imply that the reader will be enabled to trace out "Ritualism and its errors" (which would thus appear to be independent phenomena with a common source) more successfully than he may have done before. Indeed, Ritualism plays an extremely subordinate part in the story, and the "tracing to its source" consists chiefly in a round but not very novel assertion, that it is a childish imitation of Romanism. The title, however, compresses into a small space the essence which is diluted into a good many pages of the novel. "The Means and the End" refers to the celebrated maxim which Jesuit priests are notoriously in the habit of quoting to each other in order to justify the most atrocious frauds, murders, and hypocrisies; the "Chaplain's Secret" refers to the particular piece of infernal machination by which the Jesuit chaplain of a noble English family is described as endeavouring to preserve their vast estates from falling into heretical hands; and the statement about Ritualism is a little illogical outburst of feminine disgust, put in rather to relieve the author's feelings than to describe with any accuracy the purpose of the work. The whole book is a succession of such little gushes, put together with very little art, but doubtless to the great satisfaction of the writer. The result is, that her novel has a certain accidental merit, which she probably never contemplated—namely, that it is an unconscious exhibition of the author's character. In any other point of view, it is as worthless as even a religious novel very well can be; it is at the lower end of the scale in which such books as *Queechy* occupy the highest rank. There may be some class of society which takes pleasure in this kind of literature, or otherwise it would not be produced so freely; we are too ignorant of the canons which pass current among the class to judge whether *The Means and the End* comes up to their standard or not; but, judging by the rules of the outside world, it is totally unreadable except for the reason we have suggested, that it contains an involuntary or rather amusing portrait of the lady who, in all simplicity, endeavours to convert the world by this pleasing expedient. Perhaps a few remarks upon the results which we have discovered may save our readers the trouble of dipping into it for themselves.

But for the statement on the title-page that Mrs. Paull is the author of *Lucy West*, the *Doctor's Vision*, &c., we should certainly have supposed this to be a first attempt. As it is, we presume we must first set down the naïveté with which the regular old novelists' tricks are employed rather to Mrs. Paull's contempt for the form of fictitious narrative which she condescends to use than to actual inexperience. It is desirable to meet the snares of the Evil One by employing counterplots of a similar character. Rowland Hill, or some other universal peg for stories, complained of the devil having all the best tunes to himself, and religious bodies think it a shame that he should have all the most amusing books. They therefore bring themselves to put their pious exhortations into the outward form of a novel, in order to attempt an effective countermeasure; but they rather shrink from the unaccustomed effort. They slur over this part of their task, feeling that they wear their disguise awkwardly; and they end by adopting some of the most common forms of fiction, as though, under so unobtrusive a dress, they might hope to escape detection. Thus Mrs. Paull borrows, though she never freely uses, the attached Irish nurse of fiction, who always says Arrah, and Astore, and Cushla macree; and the equally tiresome sailor, who despises "landlubbers," and talks about pretty girls being in chase "with all their sails unfurled." Indeed Mrs. Paull becomes quite enthusiastic about this mythical personage. "Recklessly courageous at the cannon's mouth," sailors, she tells us, "are yet the very first to surrender when a woman smiles; frequently, alas! to their own injury and loss"; and, though there may be exceptions, England glories in the fact that the free-hearted, generous, confiding nature of the true British "sailor is the rule, and not the exception, whether he walks the quarterdeck or toils before the mast." Along with these beings, who, whether they ever had any corresponding realities or not, bid fair to become as conventional as griffins or unicorns, Mrs. Paull believes in some creatures less widely distributed. Thus there is the British nobleman whose ancestors came over with the Conqueror, and whose eldest sons, however often they may be changed at nurse, always go about the world with the mark of high breeding stamped upon their features, and a curiously-shaped brown mark upon their left arms. This last peculiarity is perhaps the most useful practically, and certainly serves, in the present instance, to confute the diabolical devices of the priests; but the "glorious eyes" and the general air of noble blood perhaps appeal more forcibly to the imagination. "Whatever may be asserted by the levellers of the present day, it is doubtless a fact that children inherit from their parents the peculiar distinctions which mark the different classes of society, quite as surely as they do their physical and mental characteristics." Notwithstanding which, it was very fortunate for the young Lord Ellesdon that he had not only a brown mark on his elbow, but a couple of cards sown into his jacket.

These remarks will have at once revealed to our readers the whole of the story. We need not therefore go much into detail, as indeed the inartificial way in which it is put together would

render any account of the plot a matter of some difficulty. It extends over a good many years, and employs a large number of actors. Every other chapter begins according to the established formula, of which this is one example:—"Holloa, my hearty, for what port are you bound?" The speaker was a man of middle height," &c. &c., who was, we may add, a tool of the Jesuits. Every such commencement tells like a fresh start, dislocates the narrative, and generally introduces a batch of new characters, besides involving a leap backwards or forwards over a number of years. Consequently, the string of events becomes rather difficult to unravel, and after a time we find ourselves engaged in solving an unusual number of those disagreeable problems which unskilful novelists are always presenting for our consideration, and which generally are something to this purpose—if A. B. turns out to be the son of C. D.'s stepmother, and you entirely forget who A. B. and C. D. are, what effect will the discovery produce upon the claim of E. F. to the G. peerage? We always give it up, but somewhat to the loss of our interest in the story. However, the general result is plain enough. The interesting young gentleman with the unmistakable mark of high birth on his brow is heir to a peerage and a noble estate. The Jesuit of fiction, who abounds to a considerable extent, and who is of course a man of delicate appearance, expansive forehead, and portentous intellect and cunning, naturally wishes to keep him out of the way in order that the peerage and estate may fall to the share of a youth who is, or is expected to be, a member of the true Church. Consequently, the rightful heir is first changed at nurse, and then goes through a variety of adventures, which we know will end in his turning up at the proper time and exhibiting his brown mark to the confusion of all detractors. At one period he is accidentally adopted by a true Protestant, also of noble family and princely wealth, who meets him on board of a Boulogne steamboat, left to himself at the age of five years. It would perhaps have been natural, under the circumstances, to discover the father of the lost little boy; and the boy himself knows the name of his supposed father, and that he lives at Dover. Accordingly, Mr. Vernon, his discoverer, "felt tempted to write and address a letter, 'Mr. Dalton, Dover, England,' and trust to the post-office to find him." This plan, for some reason, "seemed scarcely feasible," and Mr. Vernon accordingly resolves to bring the child up, give him an excellent education, and describe him to his friends as his own nephew. This is ingenious and probable, and the little boy, as he grows up, is thus fortified against all the wiles of Jesuits, and provided with an admirable tutor. The Jesuits send out an agent to convert him, but they fail signally; the emissary "might have an antagonist in the tutor, whom he believed to have been Senior Wrangler in Cambridge, and therefore open arguments must be carefully avoided." We hope that Senior Wranglers will appreciate this delicate compliment.

We are quite unable to trace the young gentleman's career any further; but it is edifying in the highest degree. All the good people get peerages, or excellent wives or husbands, as the case may be, and are admirably provided for. The numerous characters go about dying in the most delightful way, giving the fullest testimony at the moments of their deaths to the truths of the Bible and Protestantism. If they are Jesuits or Jesuit-ridden they suffer considerable tortures, but are allowed to repent at the last moment. Indeed we have only one difficulty left. Providence always interferes so conspicuously that we can't understand why everybody is not converted. Mrs. Paull is indeed careful to tell us, in answer to an imaginary argument from one of her Jesuits, that it is presumptuous to inquire too carefully into the designs of Providence in killing off particular people; but her own story contradicts her precepts. Indeed, at one place she goes entirely out of her way to enforce the doctrine she denounces. A mother is too fond of her eldest son, whereupon the son falls out of a railway-carriage two or three pages afterwards and is summarily killed on the spot. In fact, if it is not meant to prove that Providence is on her side, the whole story loses its point. Why else should all the good people get all the plums, and all the bad people die miserably? But perhaps we ought only to interpret providential events when they are manifestly on the side of the truth. In other cases they are inscrutable mysteries.

We have already remarked that this has nothing to do with what is called Ritualism, except indeed that one Ritualist clergyman is represented as a tool of the Jesuits. But the whole moral atmosphere is evidently healthy, and the book may safely be recommended to good Protestant families who like to have their sermon washed down by a little harmless fiction. The rest of the world may judge for itself.

## LORD DUFFERIN'S IRELAND.\*

(Second Notice.)

IT is, as we have seen, not strange that the grand object of every Irishman should be to get land. There is nothing else for him to turn to, unless he goes to work with a linen manufacturer in Belfast, or emigrates. The question is what should be the proportionate degrees of these alternative resources. There are no manufactures out of Ulster, and there is no visible chance of any being created elsewhere. The conditions of the soil are against them in part. The genius of the people is also against them to some extent. A man

\* *The Means and the End; or, the Chaplain's Secret.* By Mrs. Henry H. B. Paull. London: Houlston & Wright. 1867.

\* *Irish Emigration and the Tenure of Land in Ireland.* By Lord Dufferin. London: Willis. 1867.



must therefore take to the land, or leave the country. One school of writers says that he should not take to emigration, but take to agriculture; and that emigration should be discouraged. Mr. Butt is the modern apostle of this school. According to him, emigration is the symptom of a chronic cachexia. The Irish land should support the Irish people, and it is only the cruelty of Irish landlords and the badness of Irish land laws which prevent this. The school to which Lord Dufferin belongs holds that the Irish land is insufficient to maintain the large population which, but for emigration, would now be starving on it, and that any laws which would give the peasantry a permanent interest in the soil would be equally injurious to them and to the country at large.

We are inclined to take this last view of the question. We cannot forget the terrible revelations which the Devon Commission gave of the three-acre and five-acre holdings, and the dismal consequences which flowed from them. And we think that any kind of legislation which would tend to bring back that state of things should be most earnestly avoided. We have already quoted extracts to prove that *la petite culture* does not ensure the prosperity of the Belgian small farmers. French statistics prove the same thing with regard to the small landowners in France. An important citation from M. About shows that in 1851, of the 7,846,000 proprietors, occupying 126,000,000 separate *parcelles*, 3,000,000 were so indigent that they could not pay their land-tax, though in 600,000 cases it did not amount to a halfpenny a year. The same author thus writes on certain effects of small proprietorships:—

La révolution de 93, en morcelant les biens nationaux, a fait une chose agréable au peuple et même utile pour un certain temps. Il est bon qu'il y ait beaucoup de propriétaires. Mais personne n'avait prévu l'effet désastreux que ces deux causes associées devaient produire en un demi-siècle. Le paysan, ivre de propriété, a fait pour la terre toutes les folies qu'un amant fait pour sa maîtresse. Tout le monde a voulu acheter, presque personne n'a voulu vendre. Si un hectare tombait aux mains de dix héritiers, chacun d'eux prétendait garder et cultiver ses dix acres. Celui qui avait entre les mains un petit capital disponible, ne s'en servait pas pour améliorer sa terre, mais pour en acquérir une nouvelle. La concurrence des acheteurs a produit une telle hausse que le revenu net est tombé en plus d'un endroit au-dessous de 2 pour 100. Et plus d'un malheureux, aveuglé par la passion, empruntait à des taux usuraires de quoi payer le prix de son champ! C'était la ruine organisée; la ruine des hommes et du sol.

No one who has travelled in France can fail to have observed facts confirmatory of these remarks. The life of a French small proprietor is a very hard one. It is hard even in the genial climate of the Pyrenees; it is much harder amid the rigours of the Department of the North. His house is comparatively comfortable, his food coarse and poor in the extreme, his debts heavy and oppressive. But there are other countries where the condition of the peasant proprietors is worse even than it is in France. France is a land of varied climate and productions, a land of corn, olives, mines, and manufactures. Norway, on the other hand, has no manufactures. Norway is essentially an agricultural country. Most of the heads of families are proprietors of the soil. Their lives are still harder, and their food coarser, than those of French peasants. An English labourer would turn up his nose at the bread which a Norwegian proprietor habitually eats. Yet a Norwegian can get land at a tithe of the rate which an Irish peasant would pay for it. So much for the general characteristics of peasant proprietorship. Everywhere—in Norway, France, Belgium, and Switzerland—they suffer a great want of material comfort, and of that civilization which accompanies the possession of comforts. In Ireland the discomfort and poorness of living are augmented by the competition for land, by the rents paid, by the debts and mortgages contracted for the good will of a yearly tenancy, or for the purchase of a lease. Mr. Butt and his disciples say that most of these evils spring from the uncertainty of tenure, the growing difficulty of getting leases, and the arbitrary evictions enforced by the landlords. Mr. Butt proposes that every tenant should have a statutory option to take a lease of sixty-three years at a rent one-third below the full or competition value. "Thus," Lord Dufferin says, "by a single stroke of the pen, the whole of the landed property of Ireland is to be withdrawn from the control and enjoyment of those who have either purchased or inherited it, and is to remain for two entire generations at the disposal of the 540,000 persons who may happen, at the passing of this Act, to be in the occupation of its several subdivisions." To understand aright the consequences of such a provision, it is only necessary to peruse the evidence given in this very book of the propensity to sublet and subdivide which is so generally evinced by Irish tenants, despite of every stipulation to the contrary. Lord Dufferin says:—

Up to nearly the close of the last century the great proportion of the country was in pasture, and the population was less than half what it amounted to in 1841. The holdings were of considerable size, and when a farm was let the landlord never dreamt of its being converted into tillage, and no provisions against subdivision were introduced. But as population multiplied the situation changed, and the enormous rise in the price of grain and provisions on the breaking out of the French war made it the interest of the tenant to subdivide his land as minutely as he could. He accordingly introduced an Irish edition of what is known as "*la petite culture*."

It is true most of the later leases contained clauses against subletting, but an unexpected legal subtlety rendered them practically inoperative, and when attempts were made to stop an innovation which in no way benefited the landlord, most proprietors found, after going to great expense, that they were completely powerless. The practice consequently spread, and an obnoxious class of middlemen, as they were termed, relet the greater portion of the soil of Ireland at rack-rents to their teeming countrymen. But though the majority of middlemen became constituted in this manner, there is no

doubt that sometimes they were placed in possession of land by the owners, with the express intention they should sublet, and it is with this method of procedure adopted by a few that the entire class have been credited. But though the experiment turned out unsuccessfully, there was nothing at the time to warn the proprietor against it, and it can be easily conceived that many a landlord, speaking neither the language, nor professing the same religion as his tenants, might consider it not only a very convenient, but a very popular alternative to give a long lease at a low rent to some person less alien to the peasants in race and religion than himself, upon the understanding that he might relet it in smaller areas.

As to the evils of this propensity we quote the following evidence:—

*Evidence of Richard Mayne, Esq., Agent and Magistrate.*

Does the subletting or subdividing of farms still continue?—Oh, yes. Is it permitted by the landlords?—They cannot stop it. What means do they take to attempt to stop it?—They cannot take any; they try as well as they can, by turning out the tenant; but if you dispossess a man and his family, it creates such a sensation that people cannot do it; it is impossible to do it.

*Evidence of Edward Spoule, Esq., Linen Bleacher and Land Proprietor.*

Is the subletting or subdividing of farms carried on to any extent?—It is too much so; and it is injurious to the landlord as well as the tenantry themselves; it is destructive to the accumulation of capital, and lowers the farming population, so as to render them subject to greater privations than day labourers. It is done in two ways—one to provide for children marrying, by dividing the tenement, and another to procure some money, by the sale of a portion of the farm, to enable a struggling farmer to clear off a debt. In both cases the evils are permanent and the benefits slight.

*Evidence of Thomas Ware, Esq., Land Proprietor, Vice-chairman of Board of Guardians, and Magistrate.*

What steps do they take to prevent it?—They are generally obliged to yield to it, the remedy afforded by law is so difficult of attaining. At the time that the Subletting Act was in force in this country, my father and I jointly let a small lot of ground to a Roman Catholic clergyman; there was as strong a clause inserted in the lease against subletting as the skill of the legal man could devise. . . . He gave a part of the ground to his brother, and a part to his sister. His sister got a license, and opened a public-house upon the premises. I did not like this getting on. My immediate tenant retained in his own hand one small field, containing probably an acre or an acre and a half of land. I brought an ejectment against him for a breach of covenant in subletting. I had a record in court upon it, and it was with extreme difficulty that I was able to sustain the case, though I proved that the county rate was paid in three separate payments—one by the brother, one by the sister, and a third portion for the small field he kept as a colourable possession in his own hand. I succeeded in getting a verdict, but it was afterwards set aside, and an order for a new trial came down—and all this arising from the impossibility on my part to prove that those lettings had taken place by written agreement. It was set up by him, "I put in my brother as my steward or caretaker, and lent my sister the use of the house;" but finally I succeeded.

Now, let any one imagine the inevitable results of 540,000 Irish tenancies for a term of sixty-three years—tenancies, in many cases, of farms so small that, according to the concurrent evidence of all practical men, they could not be improved; and these let to men who, after exhausting the soil themselves by their own thriftless and barbarous cultivation, mortgaged it, sublet it, and subdivided it among children and grandchildren, and burdened it with all sorts of charges and portions, and the usual luxurious appendages of estates of 10,000*l.* a year! What chance would the Irish landlord have of ever getting back his land so demised? And what would be its condition if ever he did succeed in getting it back? We have sometimes thought some of the cases of eviction cited by Mr. Butt harsh and cruel, but we confess that, after such testimony as that of Mr. Ware and others, we are not surprised at the desperate measures occasionally adopted by Irish landlords to prevent the recurrence of those horrible calamities which indefinite subletting formerly caused, and which culminated in the famine and pestilence of twenty years ago. With the story of that dreadful epoch, and with the record of the Devon Commission in our hands, we do not see how any thoughtful and patriotic statesman can seriously support so wild a scheme as Mr. Butt's. We strongly commend to the consideration of our readers the notes to Lord Dufferin's book, from page 102 to page 112, and from 215 to 220 inclusive.

As for Mr. Bright's plan, Lord Dufferin recognises the difficulty of finding tenants who could pay, in addition to their usual obligations, five or six per cent. for a number of years on whatever sum the fee-simple of their holdings might be worth, and also the inexpediency of imposing on Government either the liabilities of an unpaid landlord or the duties of an exacting land-agent. And he asks, not without reason, "Supposing the creation of these small proprietorships happily effected, is it so certain that the general condition of the country would be improved? What guarantee have we against these several infinitesimal estates acquiring the character of the already existing perpetuities?" So long as the land is all in all to an Irishman, so long as every labourer aspires to be a tenant, and every tenant to be a landowner, and every man, whether landlord or tenant, has an indefinite number of children to be portioned and provided for out of the land, there is no guarantee at all. The contemplated system would establish a pauperized community on the grandest scale ever known.

This is the real terror of Irish landlords. They have in their memories the awful warnings of past days, and they fear that what has been may be again. The Southern and Western Celt clings to the Irish soil. He has a dim tradition of tribal rights and tanist powers, of times when his ancestors were lords of the land on which he is a hireling. His favourite poetry burns with the indignant recognition of his present, and his aspiration after

another, fate. He looks upon his rights as in abeyance, not wholly lost. When he emigrates, he cherishes the hope of returning to occupy the lands of his ancestors. Not so the Ulster peasant. Without Celtic traditions or imaginings, he looks upon the land as an investment. If he cannot get it, he makes up his mind to emigrate, and to realize abroad the fortune which is denied to him at home. Hence the difficulty of dealing with tenants—especially small tenants—in the South and West of Ireland. A lease is made too often the pretext for a perpetuity—a perpetuity too with the appendage of two or three generations who must all be bought out or turned out. That the fears of the landlords sometimes make them harsh in the exercise of their powers we do not deny. That the occasional instances or exaggerated reports of cruelty have done great harm to themselves and to Ireland is equally undeniable. That the kind of legislation proper to adjust the competing claims of landlords and tenants will require much patience and consideration is also clear. But we fear that something beyond legislation is necessary for this purpose. If the present Irish emigration ended by introducing an English immigration, a great step would have been made towards the improvement of relations which depend less on Acts of Parliament than on the character and mutual confidence of the contracting parties.

On this point Lord Dufferin's book should be read, but read by the side of those suggestions which it is intended to confute. We will conclude our notice of his useful work by expressing our satisfaction at being able to gather from the appendix that—notwithstanding the denials given to the form of the assertion contained in his letters—the wages of the Irish labourer, skilled and unskilled, have increased, as it was natural to suppose they would increase, concurrently with the process of emigration, the depletion of the labour market, and the consolidation of the smallest class of farms. While grumbling, threatening, and conspiring, Thady and Pat are far better off than they were twenty-five years ago, as regards the pay which they receive, the food which they eat, and the clothes which they wear. If ever a malignant fairy wished to inflict an irreparable injury on them, no more effectual means could be devised than to give them each a sixty-three years' lease of a farm of five or seven acres.

#### MEDIEVAL NOTICES OF CHINA.\*

THE present is an appropriate time for collecting the fragments of mediæval and classical literature relating to the vast Empire of China. The period of imperfect knowledge of the far East is passing away, not only for the learned few and the merchants and travellers who supply them with information, but for the great mass of readers in Western Europe, to whom China is now brought so near by modern facilities of communication. We are also on the eve of a much closer intercourse. Already the promoters of the telegraph are threatening to invade China in three different directions. The Russian Government lines extend from St. Petersburg to Kiachta, within four days' journey of Peking; a New York Company is established to connect the Chinese ports with America, by means of the line across Behring's Straits; and a project has been long on foot to extend the Indo-European telegraph to China and Australia. The next few years will probably see the threatened invasion successful in all three directions, and competition will ensure that abundance of messages which has been unattainable with America and India, and on which depends any keen interest here both in Chinese events and those which befall English communities in regions so remote. Familiar intercourse and knowledge will also be promoted by the multiplication of mail routes, and still more by the extension of railways, which cannot be much longer delayed. The instinct of commerce is towards the shortest road, and as the trade is enormous, the imperiousness of the demand must very soon call forth the supply. Already the interval between the most eastern point of the Indian railway system and the western provinces of China is not very great; and it is not to be supposed that the immobility of Government officials, both here and in India, in regard to this matter, will endure eternally. Obdurate as Governments are, there are levers which in time can move them. Assisted by railway enterprise in China itself, the railway connexion of India with China would greatly facilitate the transit between Chinese ports and Europe. A week from Shanghai to Bombay would be substituted for the month's voyage which must now be performed. Further, while these railways are in progress, we may assume that the interval between India and Western Europe will be abridged. The Euphrates Valley line is again beginning to be thought of, and will not be deferred indefinitely, when the weekly mail from Bombay about to be established has created a desire for accelerated speed in each mail, so as to prevent two or three being *en route* in each direction at once. It is not looking much farther ahead to suppose Sir Macdonald Stephenson's project executed, and a railway completed to Constantinople, along with the junction of the extremities of the Euphrates Valley line on the one side with the European system at Constantinople, and, on the

other, with the Indian system extended to Kurrachee. This would give us a through railway route all the way to China, to be followed at no distant interval, if not preceded, by a competing line through Russian territory to Kiachta, and thence to Peking. Overland routes will thus have been restored to their early pre-eminence as the avenues to China, and the daily throngs of travellers and press of traffic between East and West will multiply acquaintanceship and knowledge. On the eve of a revolution so great, the careful collection and editing of documents showing the state of past knowledge is, as we have said, opportune. Along with our full existing knowledge we shall have the incomplete pictures of the past necessary to the comprehension of Chinese history, and some strange episodes in the fortunes of Christian civilization, in which we shall have more interest as the localities will be better known.

We think, therefore, very highly of the idea of the present publication under the auspices of the Hakluyt Society. What we understand to be intended is a complete collection of mediæval notices of China, with the exception of Marco Polo's travels, which are considered important enough to deserve independent editing. We are of opinion also that Colonel Yule has executed very ably the task of translator and annotator, which was by no means an easy one. The mere collection of certain books of travel, or slighter mediæval notices of China, would not have been any great matter. Indeed, most of the narratives in these volumes—Ibn Batuta's, the travels of Benedict Goetz, and Friar Odoric's—have all appeared in an English dress, though not lately republished; but it requires no little learning and acquaintance with the works of travellers and geographers to collate and bring out the full meaning of these old records. Little as things change in the East, there have been great changes since the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, necessitating a very high degree of ingenuity in the work of identifying the places visited by old travellers, and illustrating their remarks. The patience, industry, and skill which Colonel Yule has brought to bear are manifest in every line, and whatever mistakes minute criticism might detect in his conclusions, they are so generally sound that, as a guide, he may safely be taken on trust by the unlearned reader. Especially valuable are the suggestions as to the origin of the extravagant reports which injured the credit of these early travellers at the time. No doubt the travellers occasionally told "crammers" to magnify their vocation, as when Friar Odoric says he saw "tortoises bigger in compass than the dome of St. Anthony's Church in Padua," or when Ibn Batuta exaggerates by three or four times the measurement of Indian monuments. But usually the most astonishing things they recorded were hearsay, such as Friar Odoric's notice of the Dead Sea, "the water whereof runneth ever towards the south, and if any one falleth into that water he is never seen more." The source of this legend is clearly identified in a native report about the sea south of the Straits of Bali. As we now perceive, if our ancestors had been of a critical turn, given to comparing notes, they might have constructed a very fair picture of the Chinese Empire by eliminating from all the narratives what was hearsay, and piecing together only the accounts of what travellers declared they had seen. The brevity of the narratives, and the directness with which the main features of Chinese society are seized and described, are beyond praise, and might serve as models for moderns, who have too often the necessity of book-making before their eyes. Nothing could be better, for instance, than Friar Odoric's description of the ceremonial at the Chinese Court, and the inconvertible paper currency, in which financial expedient the Chinese so long preceded us. Colonel Yule's annotations, by making clear the references in the more doubtful passages, increase our respect for the veracity of these early travellers, whose wonderful relations were scoffed at by an age not otherwise sceptical, to be verified by more frequent means of knowledge when scepticism is more active. Colonel Yule likewise deserves praise for the preliminary essay in which he sums up the labours of travellers and geographers, prior to the verification by Goetz of the suspicion that the land known to travellers through Tartary as Cathay was identical with the China known to travellers by sea. It is a pleasure to see a good bit of genuine criticism settling many important points of historical interest. The result in the present instance is a mass of trustworthy material ready for the use of the future historian of the Asiatic Continent, and in the meantime for the use of all who are interested in the study of Oriental literature and history.

The history of Christianity in China may serve as a specimen of the questions illustrated. There are legends of the Apostles Thomas and Bartholomew having preached in China, and it is less doubtful that the Nestorian Church in the seventh century displayed a very active missionary spirit, spreading Christianity all over Central Asia and Tartary, and into the "Central Flowery Kingdom" as well. In the first quarter of the eighth century there were metropolitan sees at Herat and Samarcand, and in China; and in the ninth century the metropolitan of China is mentioned by Syrian authors with the metropolitans of India, Persia, Merv, Syria, Arabia, Herat, and Samarcand, as excused by the distance of their sees from attending the Synods of the Church. This early Christianity had to compete in Asia Minor with Mahommedanism, and in China with Buddhism—in both cases yielding to its rival after a struggle of centuries. Nor was the Christianity which yielded always weak and struggling. Without assuming the authenticity of the alleged Syro-Chinese inscription said to have been unearthed by the Jesuit missionaries in 1625 at Singanfu, narrating the great progress of

\* *Cathay, and the Way Thither; being a Collection of Mediæval Notices of China.* Translated and Edited by Colonel Henry Yule, C.B., late of the Royal Engineers (Bengal), with a Preliminary Essay on the Intercourse between China and the Western Nations previous to the Discovery of the Cape Route. 2 vols. Printed for the Hakluyt Society.



Christianity under Imperial favour in the seventh and eighth centuries, the decrees and notices in Chinese records show that the Christian Church must have attained at that time considerable extent and power. There was a great falling off a century later, as appears from a notice in an Arabian author, "Mohammed, the son of Isaac, surnamed Abulfaraj," who mentions the return to Bagdad of a Christian monk from China, bringing the news that the Church had been destroyed in China, and only one Christian left. A few centuries after, when the wave of Mongolian conquest swept eastward over China, and westward into Europe, Christianity made way among the Tartars, and was again established in China. To this period belongs the mythical Prester John, who really appears to have had a substantial original among the Mongols. In the thirteenth century China was visited by Catholic missionaries from the Pope, and John of Monte-Corvino, a Franciscan monk, was made Archbishop of Khanbalig or Peking. The missions flourished under the patronage of the Emperor, and not the least interesting part of the present volume is the collection of missionary notices of this period. Chief among these, of course, are Friar Odoric's travels, but the collection includes letters from John of Monte-Corvino and his associates, reporting progress, and beseeching news from Europe, from which sometimes they do not appear to have heard for twelve years. There are also extracts from the strange History of Bohemia by John de Marignolli, who had been a legate from the Pope to China, and, being instructed in his old age to write a History of Bohemia for the sovereign of that country, to whose Court he was on a visit, included in it an account of China and his reminiscences of travel—a history which mouldered in the Prague archives for centuries, till 1768, when it was published by a German archaeologist, though the passages relating to China did not attract notice till 1820. At the time of these missions, a good deal of commercial intercourse began to spring up between China and the West, but, from what causes is not very clear, the intercourse was interrupted. Both Catholic and Nestorian Christianity disappeared altogether; and when the Jesuit missionaries reached China in the sixteenth century in the track of the Portuguese, it appeared as if Christianity had been hitherto unknown, the Jesuits being themselves ignorant of their Franciscan predecessors. What was the fate of Jesuit missions after a temporary tide of prosperity is well enough known. This melancholy history is full of warning. There is a popular tendency to believe that the history of Christianity has been one of almost unvarying aggression and conquest; but in Asia, after threatening to conquer, it was supplanted by rivals we are accustomed to look on with contempt. Only a few relics of the flourishing churches of the eighth century remain in the recesses of Persia.

The history of Christianity in China is only one of the many interesting questions on which Colonel Yule throws light. We might name, among others, the parallel history of Mahomedanism in the east of Asia, and the history of most of the conquests which China and Asia have undergone since the Christian era. In regard to very recent events, Colonel Yule's information appears to have been in one instance imperfect, for, while noticing the fact, he has no details to give of the recent revolution in Chinese Turkestan and Dzungaria by which the Chinese rulers have been completely expelled the country. The Russian newspapers within the last two years have contained frequent notices of the revolution, which has been finally completed this year by the arrival of a great many Chinese fugitives on Russian territory, in the neighbourhood of the Ili district. But the information in general is so accurate and complete that this defect is a very small matter. Perhaps we should notice, in conclusion, the question of the future of China, immediately suggested by a work like this, and at which Colonel Yule for a moment glances. It is not merely what influence Christianity, which has several times failed to gain a footing, can now have, but what will be the whole effect of European civilization in contact with institutions so decaying and corrupt as those of China. Colonel Yule points out that the anomaly in China is the vast growth of population, in spite of political and social decay. The world has often seen the fall of empires accompanied and hastened by the "decay of men," and the place of the fallen race has been taken by others; but the prospect of so numerous a people as the Chinese being displaced is too terrible to the imagination. A strict Darwinian, applying the theory of the "struggle for existence" to the human race, may perhaps contemplate the prospect with the equanimity shown by most people in the prospect of the inevitable fate of Red Indians or New Zealanders; but the majority are incapable of such a stretch of scientific logic. At any rate, the prospect is a remote one; and for a time, Europeans and Chinese will have to adjust their mutual relations on the close footing that is now unavoidable. Whatever happens, it can scarcely be doubted that that ancient empire is destined to a great revolution. The mental life of China might resist, as it has done, the influx of European philosophy and ideas—many of them belonging to stages of thought through which the Chinese fancy they have long since past—but our science and material inventions are absolutely novel, and cannot fail to alter much in the thought of China as they have done in Europe. Perhaps the problem of the future would seem less obscure if the history of Chinese philosophical systems and religion were better understood among Europeans, and such an understanding appears to be needful before an entrance for European civilization can be gained into the heart of Chinese life. We

observe that the publication of annotated editions of English classics for the use of native schools in India has begun. A movement in China for works of a similar description would be a proof that the Chinese are really waking up to the necessities of the times that have come upon them; but we fear there is not yet enough Chinese scholarship among Europeans, nor a sufficient number of Chinese educated in European as well as Chinese literature, to supply such a demand. Europeans themselves may have more to learn from the Chinese than they imagine, and the mutual understanding by Europeans and Chinese of each other's literature ought to be the first fruit of the close intercourse now springing up.

## NOTICE.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any News-agent, on the day of publication.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes may be had at the Office, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

## THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OR  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d. unstamped; or 7d. stamped.

## CONTENTS OF No. 606, JUNE 8, 1867:

The Crowned Heads at Paris. The House of Commons and Redistribution. Russia and the Slavonians. The House of Lords. American Finance. Practical Jokes. British Recreations. The Apotheosis of Paris. Clergymen in Parliament. The Council of India. The Report on Army Transport and Supply. Co-operation and Combination. Mr. Hallé's Recitals. Ascent Races. The Oxford Reformers of 1498. Dr. Cumming on Ritualism. The Great Pyramid. Hannah Lightfoot and Dr. Wilmot. Paine's Siege of Rouen. The Means and the End. Lord Dufferin's Ireland. Mediaeval Notices of China.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

**WHIT MONDAY.—LONDON BALLAD CONCERTS,** St. James's Hall. Director, Mr. John Boosey.—THE LAST CONCERT OF THE SEASON, Monday, June 10. Vocalists, Miss Louisa Pyne and Madame Scherrington, Madlle. Liebart, Miss Edith Wynn, the Misses Wells, and Madame Sainton-Dolby; Mr. Cummings, Mr. Montem Smith, Mr. Winn, Mr. Chaplin Henry, and Mr. Weiss. Violoncello, Signor Sottolini. Pianoforte, Madame Arabella Goddard. Conductors, Mr. Frank Hill and Mr. J. L. Hutton.—Stalls, 6s.; Family Tickets, to admit Four, 12s.; Balcony, 2s.; Tickets, 6s. and 1s. to be had of Mr. Austin, 23 Piccadilly; Chappell & Co., 50 New Bond Street; Keith, Frewer, & Co., Chesapeake; and Boosey & Co., 25 Holles Street.

**MUSICAL UNION.—LUBECK** on Tuesday, June 11, his First and only Performance this Season, with AUER, last time, RIES, MOYALTE, and GÖFFEL, and JACQUARD from Paris. Quartet, No. 2, in A, Beethoven; Sonata, F minor, Appassionata, Beethoven; Quintet, B flat, Mendelssohn. Solo, Violin and Pianoforte, by Auer and Lubbeck. To begin at a Quarter past Three. Tickets, 10s. 6d. each, to be had at the usual places. Visitors, on giving their names, can pay at the entrance to St. James's Hall, Regent Street.—Free Admissions for the remaining Matinees, except for Artists who have played at the Musical Union, and Gentlemen of the Press, will be suspended. J. ELLA, Director, 10 Hanover Square.

**WEDNESDAY MORNING, June 12.—MR. KUHE** will give his GRAND ANNUAL MORNING CONCERT, on Wednesday, June 12, at St. James's Hall. Madames Titiens, Sinico, Liebart, and Irma de Murka, Trebelli, and Madame Sainton-Dolby; M.M. Gardoni, Tom Hohler, Reichardt, and Mongini, Gassier, Hill, and Herr Rokitsky, Signor Pandolfini, and Mr. Santley. Violin, Herr Leopold Auer. Violoncello, Signor Flatti. Harmonium, Herr J. Engel. Harp, Mr. Apollonius. Pianoforte, Mr. Kuhe. Conductors, M.M. Arditi, Beignani, W. Ganz, and Mr. Benedict. Stalls, Half a Guinea; Balcony, 10s.; Area, 2s.; Gallery, 2s. to be had of all the principal Music-sellers and Libraries; Mr. Austin's Ticket Office, St. James's Hall; and Mr. Kuhe, 15 Somerset Street, Portman Square, W.

**UNDER THE IMMEDIATE PATRONAGE OF H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES AND H.R.H. THE PRINCESS OF WALES.**  
**MR. W. G. CUSINS'S ANNUAL GRAND ORCHESTRAL CONCERT,** on Thursday Morning, June 13, at Half-past Two o'clock, at the Hanover Square Rooms. Miss Louisa Pyne, Madames Sinico, Miss Ida Gillies, Madlle. Brander, Madlle. Roubaud de Courmand, and Madame Trebelli-Bellini; Mr. Tom Hohler, Mr. Whiffin, Mr. Wilford Morgan, M. Jules Lefort, and Mr. Santley. The Orpheus Glee Union. Pianoforte, Mr. W. G. Cusins and his Pupil, Miss Marian Davis. Violin, Herr Ludwig Strauss. Leader of the Orchestra, Mr. J. T. Carrodus. Conductors, Mr. Benedict and Mr. W. G. Cusins. Stalls, 10s. 6d.; Tickets, 7s. of Lamborn Cock, Addison, & Co., 62 and 63 New Bond Street, of Mr. W. G. Cusins, 23 Nottingham Place, Regent's Park, W., and all Music-sellers.

**CRYSTAL PALACE.—THE GRAND FESTIVAL BENEFIT** CONCERT, in aid of the RESTORATION FUND, under the most distinguished Patronage, on Wednesday, June 26.—Guinea Stalls, Half Guinea Tickets, and so. Admissions, at the Festival Ticket Office, at the Palace, and at Exeter Hall. Chèques or Post Office Orders should be payable to George Grove.  
NOTICE.—From the large issue of C and G, and CC and GG Stalls, made on the opening of the Festival Books on the 14th inst., early application is requisite to secure Stalls in these eligible blocks.

# BIRMINGHAM TRIENNIAL MUSICAL FESTIVAL, in aid of the Funds of the BIRMINGHAM GENERAL HOSPITAL. TWENTY-NINTH CELEBRATION.

On Tuesday, the 27th, Wednesday, the 28th, Thursday, the 29th, and Friday, the 30th August.

## Patrons.

HER MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY THE QUEEN.  
HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE OF WALES.  
HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS OF WALES.  
HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUCHESS OF CAMBRIDGE.  
HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE.

President.—The Right Hon. the Earl BEAUCHAMP.

Vice-Presidents.—THE NOBILITY and GENTRY of the MIDLAND COUNTIES.  
April 30, 1867. By Order, WILLIAM R. HUGHES, Secretary.

**METAMORPHOSES.**—The great Wonder of the Season.—Every Night at Eight, Egyptian Hall, Piccadilly. Day Performances, Wednesday and Saturday, at Three.—Tickets at Mr. Mitchell's, Royal Library, Old Bond Street; Keith, Frowse, & Co.'s, Cheapside; and at the Box Office, from Ten till Five. Mr. H. Mearns, General Manager.

**THE SOCIETY OF PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.**  
The SIXTY-THIRD ANNUAL EXHIBITION is NOW OPEN. 5 Pall Mall East. From Nine till Seven.—Admission, 1s.; Catalogue, 6d.  
WILLIAM CALLOW, Secretary.

**NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY, 29 Great George Street, Westminster,** will be OPEN to the Public on Whit Monday and Tuesday, from Ten to Six. Admission Free. Ordinary public days Mondays, Wednesdays, and Saturdays.  
By Order of the Trustees,  
GEORGE SCHARF, Secretary and Keeper.

**THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of WORKS of ART,**  
25 Old Bond Street.—This Exhibition is NOW OPEN DAILY, from Ten till Six. Admission, 1s.

**HER MAJESTY'S PICTURE—THE MARRIAGE of H.R.H. the PRINCE of WALES,** painted expressly for and by command of Her Majesty by W. P. Frith, R.A., is, by special permission, NOW EXHIBITING at the Fine Art Gallery, 11 Haymarket, daily, from Ten till Five.—Admission, 1s.

**FREE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Kensington.**—Minister, the Rev. W. H. CHANNING (brother of the Rev. Dr. CHANNING). Sunday Services at 11.15 a.m. and 7 p.m.; at TEMPORARY ROOMS, Newton House, Church Street, W.

**UNIVERSITY of LONDON.**—Notice is Hereby Given, that the next HALF-YEARLY EXAMINATION for MATRICULATION in this University will commence on Monday, June 24, 1867. In addition to the Metropolitan Examination, Provincial Examinations will be held at St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw; Stonyhurst College; St. Patrick's College, Carlow; Owens College, Manchester; and Queen's College, Liverpool.  
Every Candidate is required to transmit his Certificate of Age to the Registrar (Burlington House, London, W.), at least Fourteen days before the commencement of the Examination.  
Candidates who pass the Matriculation Examination are entitled to proceed to the Degrees conferred by the University in Arts, Laws, Science, and Medicine. This Examination is accepted (1) by the Council of Military Education in lieu of the Entrance Examination otherwise imposed on Candidates for admission to the Royal Military College at Sandhurst; and (2) by the College of Surgeons in lieu of the Preliminary Examination otherwise imposed on Candidates for its Fellowship. It is also among those Examinations of which some one must be passed (1) by every Medical Student on commencing his professional studies; and (2) by every person entering upon Articles of Clerkship to an Attorney—any such person Matriculating in the First Division being entitled to exemption from one year's service.  
May 31, 1867. WILLIAM B. CARPENTER, M.D., Registrar.

**MALVERN COLLEGE.**—The LEA SCHOLARSHIP, worth £20 per annum, for three years; and the Council Exhibition of £50, for one year; the Holder to be re-eligible at the next Election.

The EXAMINATION for these SCHOLARSHIPS will begin on Wednesday, July 31. Candidates must be below fifteen years of age on the day of Examination, and allowance will be made for difference of age.

Testimonials to be sent by July 30 to the Head-Master, of whom also any further information may be asked.  
Head-Master.—The Rev. ARTHUR FABER, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford.

**THE VERULAM TUTORIAL INSTITUTE,**  
Established to prepare CANDIDATES for the Indian and Home Civil Service.—A Staff of Sixteen Tutors, Graduates in Honours of Oxford and Cambridge (Wrangler, Seventh Classic, First Class in Law, &c.), Graduate Professors of Foreign Languages, and Indian Gentlemen. Arrangements for Resident Students.—Prospectus from W. H. SPENCER, M.A., 4 Verulam Buildings, Gray's Inn.

**WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, DIRECT COMMISSIONS, INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE, &c.**—The Rev. W. H. JOHNSTONE, M.A., Chaplain and Assistant-Professor and Examiner, for Nineteen Years, in the late Royal Indian Military College, Addiscombe, continues to prepare PUPILS for the above.—Address, Bromgrove House, Croydon, S.

**WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, the LINE, the UNIVERSITY, and all COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS.**—EIGHT PUPILS are prepared for the above by the Rev. G. R. ROBERTS, M.A., late Fellow of Cor. Ch. Coll. Cambridge, and late Professor in the R.M. College, Addiscombe.—Address, The Limes Croydon, S.

**INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION.**—Mr. WREN, M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge, assisted by a High (5th) Wrangler, an Oxford Graduate (First-class in Classical Honours), and the best Masters obtainable for all the other subjects allowed to be taken up, receives Resident and Non-Resident PUPILS. Nos. 3, 4, 11, and 16 in the recent list of Successful Candidates were prepared by Mr. Wren, Wiltshire House, Brixton, S. Mr. Wren is removing from his present address to 4 and 5 Pavia Square, Colville Gardens, Baywater, W., where he will be ready to receive Pupils the second week in June.

**CIVIL SERVICE and ARMY.**—Mr. W. M. LUPTON (Author of "English History and Arithmetic for the Civil Service and Army Examinations"), assisted by qualified Tutors, rapidly and successfully prepares GENTLEMEN for both Services. Highest references.—Address, 14 Beaufort Buildings, Strand.

**INDIA CIVIL SERVICE.—CANDIDATES for the COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION** are prepared by A. D. SPRANGE, M.A., assisted by Masters of the highest standing in all the usual admissible subjects. Reference to numerous successful Candidates.—Civil Service Hall, 15 Princes Square, Baywater, W.

**INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.—Further Examinations.**—Mr. COTTON MATHER, having a few Hours disengaged, will be happy to read with GENTLEMEN in ORIENTAL LANGUAGES and POLITICAL ECONOMY.—Address, 39 Arundel Street, Strand, W.C.

**INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.**—Resident or non-Resident Pupils.—A former MASTER in one of the Public Schools desires to increase his Number of PUPILS.—Address, S.C., care of Messrs. Varty & Cox, Adelaide Street, Strand.

**BRUNSWICK.**—Mr. HAUSMANN, of Göttingen University, begs to acquaint the Nobility and Gentry that he has RE-OPENED, at Brunswick, his Establishment for the Education of Young Gentlemen, and that he can receive a FEW PUPILS for next Session; French taught by native Masters; and German and French spoken alternately.—For Terms and further information, apply to N. HEDDMANN, Esq., Bradford; or direct to Mr. HAUSMANN, Brunswick.

**TUITION.**—The Rev. T. FIELD, B.D., Vicar of Pampesford, Cambridge, formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge, prepares PUPILS for the University or the Competitive Examinations, and has Vacancies at present. Terms at the rate of £200 per annum.

**PARIS EXHIBITION.**—A GENTLEMAN, the Principal of an important Scientific Institution, and who is well acquainted with the leading branches of Science and Art, proposes to form a SMALL PARTY about the end of June, with the view of carefully studying the Contents of the Exhibition for Educational purposes.—For Terms, &c., address J. G., 29 Walpole Street, Chelsea, S.W.

**A GERMAN GOVERNESS** of great Experience, who speaks and teaches English, French, and Italian, desires to find a SITUATION in a Family. Good references.—Apply, Madame FORTAT, 16 Rue d'Aguesseau, Paris.

**SKETCHING from NATURE.**—A LADY, well known as an Artist of position, both in Oil and Water-Colour, wishes to TRAVEL with a Family, whom she includes in an equivalent for Travel and Expenses; or with any Family Lady desiring a COMPANION. References given and required.—Address, R. T. 2, care of Mr. Rogers, 33 Maddox Street, Hanover Square.

**FOR SALE, the ADWOSON of a LIVING in a West Midland County.** Agricultural District. Two Churches. Population about 1,000. Five miles from a Station. Possession guaranteed within two years from completion of purchase, and interest at the rate of Three and a Half per Cent. on the Purchase-money till possession given. Net Income, after payment of Outgoings and Curate's Salary, and exclusive of good Rectory House standing in more than Twenty Acres of Land, about £1,500 a year. No Clerical Agent need apply.—Address, C. MALLAM, Esq., 1 Staple Inn, Holborn, London.

**REVERSIONARY PROPERTY and LEGACIES PURCHASED or MORTGAGED,** to pay 6 per cent. per annum.—Written Applications may be sent to Mr. MORRIS, Solicitor, 49 Leicester Square, W.C.

**TOURISTS and FAMILIES in SEARCH of HEALTH** and beautiful SCENERY should proceed to the ILLFRACOMBE HOTEL. Most reasonable terms.—Address, Mr. JAMES BONE, at the Hotel, Ilfracombe, North Devon. A Four-horse Omnibus meets the London Express Trains at Barnstaple.

**APARTMENTS, with ATTENDANCE, in a quiet House,** most suitable for a GENTLEMAN of studious habits.—Address, 15 Boxwood Grove, Richmond Road, Barnsbury.

**HYDROPATHIC SANATORIUM, SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill, Surrey.** Physician, Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. Univ.—for the treatment of Chronic Diseases, principally by the combined Natural Agents—Air, Exercise, Water, and Diet. Turkish Baths on the Premises, under Dr. Lane's Medical Direction.

**THE ROYAL INFIRMARY for CHILDREN and WOMEN,** Waterloo Bridge Road. Instituted 1810.—The Sufferings of poor helpless Children from Disease and Poverty are such as to call forth the utmost sympathy and consideration of the Humane and Charitable.  
This useful Hospital, which has done so much for the relief of increasing numbers of these poor little Sufferers, urgently needs the support and generous assistance of the Benevolent.  
CONTRIBUTIONS are earnestly solicited.  
Bankers.—Messrs. FOLLAN, HANBURY, & Co., 77 Lombard Street; and Messrs. CORRS & Co., 180 Waterloo Bridge Road, S.  
CHARLES J. F. RENTON, Secretary.

**RODRIGUES' DRESSING CASES and TRAVELLING DRESSING BAGS,** with Silver or Plated Fittings in every variety, MOUNTED and GERMOLLE for the BOUDOIR, TOILETTE and WRITING TABLE.  
RODRIGUES' DESPATCH BOXES and TRAVELLING WRITING CASES, in Russia or Morocco of the best quality. Blotting Books, Envelope Cases, Inkstands, and Bookslides.  
CARTE DE VISITE PORTRAIT ALBUMS, of the best make, in handsome antique Morocco and Russia bindings, also in ornate, walnut, and combed, and of new and elegant designs; and a choice Selection of elegant NOVELTIES for PRESENTS.  
At HENRY RODRIGUES', 49 PICCADILLY, LONDON, W.

**J. B. BROWN & CO.'S NEW PATENT BB LAWN MOWER.** MOWER is a revolution, so to speak, in Lawn Mowers, so far does it excel all others. All Sizes now in Stock.

**THE BB LAWN MOWER.**—Before purchasing any other, see the BB MACHINE, and you will be sure to have no other.

**THE BB LAWN MOWER.**—In Design, quality of Material, Workmanship, and Finish, very far exceeds every other Machine.

**THE BB LAWN MOWER.**—Beware of unfounded and unprincipled Statements in some Lawn Mower advertisements.

**THE BB LAWN MOWER** having more unbreakable parts than any other Mower, is far more durable. The BB HORSE and PONY MACHINES deliver the Grass and cut the Machine; and every BB MACHINE cuts the Grass Wet or Dry on Lawns, uneven or otherwise.

**THE BB LAWN MOWER.**—"The work done is of the first order, leaving the Lawn like a piece of velvet."—Mr. INGHAM, The Royal Gardens, Windsor Castle.

**THE NEW PATENT BB LAWN MOWER.**—Patented in England, France, and Belgium. All Sizes now in Stock. Patentees and Sole Manufacturers: J. B. BROWN & CO., 148 Upper Thames Street, London, E.C.

**BEDSTEADS, BATHS, and LAMPS.**—WILLIAM S. BURTON has SIX LARGE SHOW-ROOMS devoted exclusively to the SEPARATE DISPLAY of Lamps, Baths, and Metallic Bedsteads. The stock of each is at once the largest, newest, and most varied ever submitted to the public, and marked at prices proportionate with those that have tended to make his Establishment the most distinguished in this country.

Bedsteads, from ..... 12s. 6d. to £20 0s. each.  
Shower Baths, from ..... 8s. 6d. to £6 0s. each.  
Lamps (Moderator), from ..... 6s. 6d. to 47 7s. each.  
Ditto, all other kinds at the same rate.  
Pure Colza Oil ..... 3s. 7d. per gallon.

**TEA-URNS, of London Make only.**—The Largest Assortment of London make TEA-URNS in the World (including all the recent Novelties, many of which are Registered) is on Sale at WILLIAM S. BURTON'S, from 30s. to £6.

**CUTLERY, warranted.**—The Most Varied Assortment of TABLE CUTLERY in the World all Warranted, is on Sale at WILLIAM S. BURTON'S, at Prices that are remunerative only because of the largeness of the Sales.

	Table Knives per Doz.	Desert Knives per Doz.	Carvers per Doz.
31-inch Ivory Handles	13 0	10 6	5 0
31-inch fine Ivory balance Handles	18 0	14 0	5 0
4-inch Ivory balance Handles	21 0	16 0	5 0
4-inch fine Ivory Handles	20 0	20 0	8 6
4-inch finest African Ivory Handles	35 0	27 0	12 0
Ditto, with silver Ferules	47 0	35 0	12 6
Ditto, carved Handles, silver Ferules	55 0	45 0	18 0
Nickel Electro-Silver Handles	35 0	19 0	7 6
Silver Handles, of any pattern	84 0	54 0	21 0

BONE and HORN HANDLES.—KNIVES and FORKS FOR DOZENS.  
White Bone Handles ..... 11 0  
Ditto, balance Handles ..... 25 0  
Black Horn, rimmed Shoulders ..... 18 0  
Ditto, very strong riveted Handles ..... 12 6

The largest stock in existence of plated Desert Knives and Forks, and of the new plated Fish-eating Knives and Forks and Carvers.

**WILLIAM S. BURTON, GENERAL FURNISHING IRONMONGER,** by appointment, to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE gratis, and post paid. It contains upwards of six Hundred Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock of Sterling Silver and Electro-Plate, Nickel Silver and Britannia Metal Goods, Dish-Covers, Hot-Water Dishes, Stoves, Fenders, Marble Chimney-Pieces, Kitchen Ranges, Lamps, Gasoliers, Tea-Trays, Urns, and Kettles, Clocks, Table Cutlery, Baths, Toilet Ware, Turnery, Iron and Brass Bedsteads, Bedding, Bedroom Cabinet Furniture, &c., with Lists of Prices, and Plans of the Twenty large Show-Rooms, at 39 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 1a, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard, London.

**EASY CHAIRS, COUCHES, and SOFAS, of the Best Quality,** made to any Pattern.—300 different Shapes on View for Selection and Immediate Delivery.—At T. H. FILLER & SON'S Manufactory, 31, 32, and 28 Berners Street, Oxford Street, W.; 34 and 35 Charles Street, W.—Illustrated Catalogues, post free.

**FURNISH your HOUSE with the BEST ARTICLES;** they are the Cheapest in the End.—DEANE & CO.'S NEW ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE, with Priced FURNISHING LIST, gratis and post-free. This List is arranged to facilitate Purchasers in the Selection of Goods, and comprises Table Cutlery, Electro-Plate, Lamps, Baths, Fenders, Fire-irons, Iron Bedsteads, Bedding, Copper, Tin, and Brass Goods, Culinary Utensils, Turnery, Brushes, Mats, &c.—DEANE & CO., 40 King William Street, London Bridge. Established a.d. 1780.

**PICTURES, BRONZES, and WORKS of ART on SALE at** 39 Southampton Street, Strand. Pictures Cleaned, Lined, and Restored, if in the worst condition. Frames Cleaned or Regilt equal to New.  
CHARLES DEAR, 39 Southampton Street, Strand.